

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE**  
**(1978-79)**

**(SIXTH LOK SABHA)**

**HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIRST REPORT**

**UNIVERSITY GRANTS  
COMMISSION**

**[Action taken by Government on the recom-  
mendations of the Public Accounts Committee con-  
tained in their 73rd Report (Sixth Lok Sabha)]**

*Presented in Lok Sabha on 25th April, 1979*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on 25th April, 1979*



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**  
**NEW DELHI**

*April, 1979/Vaisakha, 1901 (S)*

*Price: Rs 5.00*

CORRIGENDA TO 141ST REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS  
COMMITTEE (SIXTH LOK SABHA) PRESENTED TO LOK SABHA  
ON 25TH APRIL, 1979.

...

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
(v)	7	on	an
3	5 from bottom	reiterated	reiterate
4	5	release	release
	6	and	an
10	19	speical	special
11	23	<u>Delete</u> 'at' before	'officials'
17	14	on	an
21	9	<u>Add</u> 'made' before	'by'
28	12	approval	approved
29	7	<u>Add</u> 'Act' after	'Commission'
31	15-16	maintenance	maintenance
11	27	therefore	therefor
32	27	programes	programmes
36	8	enequitable	inequitable
41	26	considera- tions	consideration
42	29	institution	institutions
55	12	report	reported
61	1	strength	strengthen
70	35	reigonal	regional
91	30	grar	gran's
92	24	with	which
93	21	extent	extant

## CONTENTS

		PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE (1978-79)	. . . . .	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	. . . . .	(v)
CHAPTER I	Report . . . . .	13
CHAPTER II	Conclusions or Recommendations that have been accepted by Government . . . . .	
CHAPTER III	Conclusions or Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in the view of the replies received from Government . . . . .	
CHAPTER IV	Conclusions or Recommendations replies to which have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration . . . . .	97
CHAPTER V	Conclusions or Recommendations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies. . . . .	102
APPENDIX	Statement of Conclusions or Recommendations . . . . .	106

# PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

( 1978-79 )

## CHAIRMAN

Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao

## MEMBERS

### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Halimuddin Ahmed
3. Shri Balak Ram
4. Shri Brij Raj Singh
5. Shri C. K. Chandrappan
6. Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt
7. Shri K. Gopal
8. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta
9. Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra
10. Shri B. P. Mandal
11. Shri R. K. Mhalgi
12. Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya
13. Shri Gauri Shankar Rai
14. Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao
15. Shri Vasant Sathe

### *Rajya Sabha*

16. Shri Devendra Nath Dwivedi
17. Shri M. Kadershah
18. Shri Sita Ram Kesri
19. Dr. Bhai Mahavir
20. Smt. Leela Damodara Menon
21. Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy
22. Shri Gian Chand Totu

## SECRETARIAT

1. Shri H. G. Paranjpe—*Joint Secretary.*
2. Shri D. C. Pande—*Chief Financial Committee Officer.*
3. Shri Bipin Behari—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*



## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf this Hundred and Forty-First Report on the action taken by Government on the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee contained in their Seventy-Third Report (Sixth Lok Sabha) on University Grants Commission relating to Ministry of Education and Social Welfare.

2. On 31 May, 1978 on 'Action Taken Sub-Committee' consisting of the following Members was appointed to scrutinise the replies received from Government in pursuance of the recommendations made by the Committee in their earlier Reports:

1. Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao—*Chairman*
  2. Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt—*Convener*
  3. Shri Vasant Sathe
  4. Shri M. Satyanarayan Rao
  5. Shri Gauri Shankar Rai
  6. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta
- } *Members*

3. The Action Taken Sub-Committee of the Public Accounts Committee (1978-79) considered and adopted the Report at their sitting held on 19th April, 1979. The Report was finally adopted by the Public Accounts Committee (1978-79) on 23 April, 1979.

4. For facility of reference the recommendations or conclusions of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report. For the sake of convenience, the recommendations or conclusions of the Committee have also been reproduced in a consolidated form in the Appendix to the Report.

5. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered to them in this matter by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India.

NEW DELHI;  
April 24, 1979.  

---

Vaisakha 4, 1901 (S).

P. V. NARASIMHA RAO,  
*Chairman.*  
*Public Accounts Committee.*

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

1.1. This Report of the Committee deals with action taken by Government on the Committee's recommendations and observations contained in their 73rd Report (Sixth Lok Sabha) on University Grants Commission commented upon in paragraph 48 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil) relating to the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare.

1.2. The Committee's 73rd Report was presented to the Lok Sabha, on 18 April, 1978 and contained 95 recommendations. According to the time schedule for furnishing Action Taken Notes on the Committee's recommendations and observations prescribed in the Committee's 5th Report (Fourth Lok Sabha), the Notes indicating the action taken by Government in pursuance of the recommendations and observations contained in the 73rd Report were required to be furnished to the Committee latest by 17th October, 1978. On a request made by the Ministry on 17th October, 1978, this time limit was extended till 17th November, 1978. However, by 25th November, 1978, advance copies of Action Taken Notes in respect of only 49 recommendations were made available by Government. On a further request made by the Ministry, the time limit had been further extended till 15th December, 1978. Advance copies of Action Taken Notes in respect of 38 recommendations were made available to the Committee on 23rd December, 1978 and on another 8 recommendations on 31st March, 1979, Action Taken Note on one recommendation contained in paragraph 1.58 (Sl. No. 7) has not yet been furnished (17-4-79).

1.3. The Action Taken Notes received from Government have been broadly categorised as follows:

(i) *Recommendations or observations that have been accepted by Government:*

Sl. Nos. 1—4, 6, 9—25, 28—31, 33—39, 42—45, 49-50, 52-53, 55—66, 69—71, 73, 75—84, 87—95.

(ii) *Recommendations or observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in the light of replies received from Government:*

Sl. Nos. 5, 26, 32, 40, 51, 54, 67-68, 74, 85.

- (iii) *Recommendations or observations replies to which have not been accepted by the Committee and which require reiteration:*

Sl. Nos. 27, 41 and 86.

- (iv) *Recommendations or observations in respect of which Government have furnished interim replies:*

Sl. Nos. 8, 46—48 and 72.

1.4. The Committee hope that final replies in regard to the recommendations to which only interim replies have been furnished will be furnished to them expeditiously after getting them vetted by Audit.

1.5. The Committee observe that the replies of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to several recommendations of the Committee desiring some specific action on the part of the Government merely state that the recommendation has been "noted" or "noted for compliance" etc. without clearly specifying the actual action taken by the Government in pursuance of the recommendation. Although in the classification of the replies given in para 1.3 such replies have been included among the recommendations which have been accepted by the Government, the Committee feel that it is incumbent on the part of the Government to indicate to the Committee the definite and conclusive action taken by Government on the recommendations. Replies of this nature are in respect of Recommendations at the Sl. Nos. indicated below:

4, 16, 17, 20, 28, 29, 34, 35, 39, 52, 56, 61, 65, 70, 77, 81, 84, 89, and 90.

The Committee expect a further reply from the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare in regard to action taken in pursuance of the above recommendations.

1.6. It has been reported to the Committee by the Audit that the Ministry have failed to make available to them files and material on the basis of which the replies to the various recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee have been prepared and sent to Audit for vetting. The Committee regret that in spite of the established procedure of such files and material being made available to Audit for vetting the replies of the Government to the Committee as a matter of course, and despite the specific requests of the Audit to do

so, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have failed to make available such files and material to Audit. In the absence of vetted replies, the Committee have perforce to formulate their report on the basis of the advance replies received from the Ministry, the authenticity of which remains unchecked by Audit. The Committee would again emphasise upon the Ministry of Finance the need for ensuring compliance by the individual Ministries of the established procedures in regard to getting the replies to the various questionnaires and recommendations from the Public Accounts Committee vetted from Audit.

1.7. The Committee will now deal with the action taken by Government on some of their recommendations.

**Desirability of bringing a larger number of colleges within the purview of development assistance from UGC stressed.**

1.8. In paragraph 6.63 of the 73rd Report (Sixth Lok Sabha) the Committee had observed that out of 3,267 colleges recognised by the University Grants Commission as on 1-12-1976, only 1,649 colleges i.e. one-half were eligible for development grants and had desired the U.G.C. to make a study of this aspect and take such measures as may be necessary to make a larger number of colleges eligible for development assistance from the U.G.C.

1.9. In a note dated the 23rd December, 1978, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have stated:

“The University Grants Commission reviews the conditions of eligibility for development grants to colleges from time to time and will continue to do this exercise.”

1.10. The reply of the Ministry that it ‘reviews the conditions of eligibility from time to time and will continue to do this exercise’ is too general and casual. The Committee reiterated that a study should be undertaken with a view to enlarge the coverage of colleges for development assistance and such measures as may be necessary, including relaxations in the conditions of eligibility, may be taken in the light of the findings of the study.

*Probe recommended into release of grants in disregard of the recommendations of the expert committee:*

1.11. On the basis of the facts disclosed in the Audit paragraph and the evidence tendered before them, the Committee had recommended a probe into the circumstances in which release of Rs. 9.00 lakhs was made despite the recommendations of an expert committee that no commitments should be made towards establishment of another Institute of Basic Medical Sciences. The Committee had in paragraph 7.38 (Sl. No. 41) of their 73rd Report (Sixth Lok Sabha) observed:

“The Committee note that in 1961, the University Grants Commission noticed that the State had established in 1955 an Institute of Medical Sciences and the Calcutta University already had post-graduate department in bio-chemistry and physiology and accordingly the university was advised that pending consideration of the scheme by an expert committee, no commitments other than those already made (which were of a minor nature) should be made towards establishment of another Institute of Basic Medical Sciences agreed to earlier in June 1960 on the recommendations of a Visiting Committee. The expert committee recommended in 1962 the interaction between clinical and non-clinical subjects for execution of the scheme.

It is disconcerting to note that the modifications suggested by the expert committee were not insisted upon before releasing the grants for the new Institute. Not only that, construction of additional stores for the Post-graduate Institute of Basic Medical Sciences was approved in February 1972 at a cost of Rs. 11.50 lakhs. Up to February 1976, the total payments made amounted to Rs. 9.00 lakhs. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee had visited Calcutta University in September 1975 and according to information made available to the Committee, the Commission had considered the report on Calcutta University on 29th April 1979, and not in June 1976, as contended. In any case, the report was available soon after the visit in September 1975 and the payment of grant of Rs. 9 lakhs up to February 1976 was against the principles of financial prudence. The Committee recommend that the circumstances in which

release of Rs. 9.00 lakhs was made despite the recommendations of the expert|Visiting Committees and of the Commission itself should be investigated and its outcome reported to the Committee. The proposed probe should also cover the issue as to why releases in excess of the shares of 2|3rd assistance were made by the Commission in disregard of the prescribed norms."

1.12. In a note dated 31st March, 1979, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have stated:

"The Calcutta University approached the Commission in September 1971 to adding two more floors to the building of the institute of Basic Medical Sciences at an estimated cost of Rs. 11,54,000. The proposal was considered by the Commission in its meeting held on December 1, 1971 and the Commission adopted the following resolution:

The Commission desired that the Calcutta University be advised that the construction of extension to the building of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences may be postponed. Attention of the University may be drawn to the need for teachers hostel and the staff quarters for which the Commission had earlier agreed to provide assistance."

The Vice-Chancellor later wrote to the Chairman, UGC, in January, 1972 that since the existing accommodation, in the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences is insufficient for housing five major departments of the basic medical sciences and the progress of the departments had been suffering on this account, he desired the Commission to re-consider their original proposal for constructing two more floors for housing all the five departments of the Basic Medical Sciences.

The Chairman on 3-2-72 agreed to the proposal in view of the pressing needs of the University. The action of the Chairman was approved by the Commission in its meeting held on 1-11-72 [*vide* item No. 2(a) (4)], as follows:

"The Commission at its meeting held on 1st December, 1971 (item No. 29) considered the proposal of the Calcutta University for construction of extension to the building of the Institute for Basic Medical Sciences, and desired that the

University be advised that the construction of extension to the building of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences may be postponed. Further, the attention of the University be drawn to the need for teachers hostel and the staff quarters for which the Commission had earlier agreed to provide assistance. This was intimated to the University. The Calcutta University intimated that the existing accommodation (three floors) is insufficient for housing the five major departments of the Basic Medical Sciences and the progress of the departments has been suffering on this account. The University again requested the Commission to reconsider the proposal for constructing two more floors for housing all departments of Basic Medical Sciences at an estimated cost of Rs. 11.54 lakhs to be met out of the Fourth Plan allocation. In view of the pressing need of the University, the construction of an extension of the building (2 additional stores at an estimated cost of Rs. 11.50 lakhs for accommodating all the departments of Basic Medical Sciences has been approved.)

The payment of Rs. 9 lakh grant referred to by the P.A.C. was sanctioned as follows:—

Letter No.	Date	Amount Rs,
1. No. F. 22-33/61 (S)/D-32	14-9-72	50,000
2. Do.	19-2-73	2,00,000
3. Do.	5-11-73	1,50,000
4. Do.	18-6-74	1,00,000
5. Do.	6-2-76	4,00,000
		-----
		9,00,000

It will be observed from the above that the last instalment was sanctioned before the report of the Visiting Committee was considered by the Commission and even the report as approved by the convenor of the Committee was not available before the sanction of the last instalment.

The additional construction of two floors was sanctioned in 1972 i.e., during the Fourth Plan period. In that Plan period, the assistance for the construction of buildings was on 100 per cent basis and it seems that it was for this reason that the grant for construction of two additional floors in the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences was agreed to on 100 per cent basis."

1.13. The Committee had earlier observed that the State had established in 1955 an Institute of Medical Sciences and the Calcutta University already had post-graduate departments in bio-chemistry and physiology. Pending consideration of the scheme by an expert committee, the Calcutta University was advised by U.G.C. that no commitments other than those already made should be made in connection with the establishment of an Institute of Basic Medical Sciences. The expert committee recommended in 1962 the integration between clinical and non-clinical subjects for execution of the scheme. The modifications suggested were not insisted upon before releasing the grants for the new Institute. Not only that, construction of additional floors for the Post-graduate Institute of Basic Medical Sciences was approved in February 1972 at a cost of Rs. 11.50 lakhs. The Committee have been informed that the Chairman, U.G.C. agreed on 3-2-1972 to the proposal in view of 'pressing needs of the University'. This was in disregard of the resolution of the Commission adopted on 1-12-1971 on postponement of the construction of extension to the building of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences. It has been contended that the last instalment of Rs. 4 lakhs was sanctioned on 6-2-1976 before the report of the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee was made available to the Commission. The Committee have not been informed of the actual date of release of funds as also whether the Convener of the Visiting Committee or any officer of the Commission accompanying the Visiting Committee had furnished an interim report immediately after the visit from September 18 to 20, 1975. The reply of the Government is also silent as to why the U.G.C. was in such a great hurry to release the grant even before the report of the Visiting Committee was available. Nor has any satisfactory reply been given as to why releases for additions to buildings were made by the Commission on cent per cent basis in disregard of the prescribed ceilings of 2/3rd being the share of U.G.C. They accordingly reiterate that a probe should be made into the circumstances in which release of Rs. 9 lakhs was made disregarding the recommendations of the Expert/Visiting Committee and the resolution of the Commission itself as also for the release of building grants in excess of the



prescribed ceiling, with a view to fix responsibility therefor. The Committee shall await a report on the outcome of the probe suggested by them.

*Delay in completion of projects for preparation of University Level books assailed.*

1.14. Dealing with undue delay in the completion of projects even after the prescribed tenure of 3 to 5 years, the Committee had made the following observation in paragraph 11.105 (Sl. No. 86) of the 73rd Report (Sixth Lok Sabha):

“The Committee note that of the 242 projects in progress as on 1 November, 1976, as many as 52 were between 3 and 4 years old and 85 were in progress for more than 4 years. In view of the fact that the original Scheme envisaged a tenure of 3 to 5 years for these projects, the Committee would like the Commission to keep a close watch on the progress of each of these projects with a view to ensure that the projects actually fructify and their completion is not unduly delayed.”

1.15. In their Action Taken Note dated 31 March, 1979, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have stated:

“The Commission is keeping a close watch on the progress of all the old projects which have been in progress for a period exceeding four years and requesting the concerned authors and the sponsoring institutions to expedite completion, through official and demi-official letters. Sometime back a demi-official letter was issued at the Commission's level. In response some of the authors explained problems faced by them and Commission is trying to help them in overcoming their genuine difficulties. The steps taken by the Commission in this behalf have up to some extent brought about improvement in the position regarding completion of manuscripts under the 242 old projects; and 45 more manuscripts have been completed, and 5 of the 242 projects have been cancelled due to non-implementation. The latest position

(as on 30-11-1978) in respect of the projects approved up to 31-10-76 is as under:

	Rs.
1. Projects initially approved . . . . .	362
2. Projects not taken up hence cancelled . . . . .	60
3. Projects where manuscripts have been completed . . . . .	110
<b>4. Projects in different stages of completion</b>	
(a) Work yet to be taken up . . . . .	2
(b) Projects less than 1 year old . . . . .	9
(c) Projects 1-2 years old . . . . .	20
(d) Projects 2-3 years old . . . . .	27
(e) Projects 3-4 years old . . . . .	7
(f) Projects 4-5 years old . . . . .	35
(g) Projects over 6 years old . . . . .	92

Some of the projects which were pending for 2 years or over on 1-11-1975, are still pending completion as on 30-11-1978 and the number of projects pending over four years of these 242 projects is 127."

1.16. The Committee had desired a close watch to be kept on the progress of each of the projects with a view to ensure that the projects actually fructified and their completion was not unduly delayed. The Committee find from the action taken reply of the Government that although some progress has been made in the completion of manuscripts of projects, out of 242 projects in progress as on 1 November, 1976, the number of projects pending over four years has further gone up from 85 as last reported to the Committee to 127 as on 30-11-1978. This is indicative of the fact that the efforts of the Commission through issue of official and demi-official letters have not produced any appreciable result. The Committee would like the Ministry to initiate positive steps, including, if necessary, revision of the rules of the scheme, to ensure that the execution of the approved projects for production of quality books is completed within the stipulated period.

*Enquiry into the circumstances leading to cornering of over two hundred building projects costing Rs. 3.22 crores by the Delhi based firms of architects:—*

1.17. In paragraphs 8.34 and 8.35 (Sl. Nos. 47 & 48) of the Report, the Committee had recommended as follows:

"8.34 The Committee note that two Delhi-based firms of architects have managed to corner over 200 building projects costing Rs. 3.22 crores in universities and colleges spread

over 7 or 8 States. The Committee suspect that such cornering of projects costing over three crores by the firms would not have been possible without the connivance of the officers of the Commission concerned with the distribution of building grants. According to a note prepared by the Secretariat of the Commission in pursuance of a query from the Chairman of the Commission on 7 December, 1973, the fact that these firms were approaching the universities and colleges with the offer that if the construction work was awarded to them they would be able to secure from the Commission building grants for the universities/colleges, came to the notice of the Commission as early as November, 1969. The Secretariat of the Commission, however, could think of nothing else except issuing a press note and a circular to the universities (and that too 6 months after, in May 1970). No instructions appear to have been issued to the various divisions/sections of the Secretariat dealing with building grants to take special care to see that this situation was not allowed to continue. Even when a recurrence subsequently came to the notice of the Commission in 1972 and thereafter, the Commission was lulled into inactivity by Secretariat officials by the citation of the aforesaid circular of May 1970 as a proof of action taken in the matter and no positive steps were taken to remedy the situation and to prevent its recurrence in future.

- 8.35. The Committee also note that despite the desire of the then Chairman of the Commission expressed in his note of 4 January, 1974 that "an enquiry may be made from officers who were incharge of the College Division as to how these two firms managed to corner so many construction projects" and a reminder by him on 4 July 1974 to the Secretary of the Commission to "look into this personally" and submit to him an early report, the Secretary of the Commission "discussed" this question with only 3 available officers (out of 5 officers concerned) and recorded in the Note put up by him to Chairman more than 7 months after his query that they "informed me that the proposals relating to the construction of the building projects were processed as per guidelines circulated to universities and colleges". He further recorded: "I may in support of these officers submit that we had not taken notice of the name of the firms of the architect which prepared the plans and

examined them as they came through the university concerned". He assured the Chairman that "to the best of my knowledge I have no reason to believe any malafide intention on the part of these officers." The Committee, however, consider this view of the Secretary of the Commission as belatedly poor attempt to defend the officers concerned with the distribution of building grants in the period before 1974. In order to dispel the strong impression of collusion on the part of the officers of the Commission with the two architects leading to the situation described above, the Committee would like the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to set up an independent enquiry Committee to investigate into the matter, and if, as a result of this enquiry, any of the officers of the Commission, irrespective of whether they are in the Commission at the moment or outside, are found to be guilty of gross irregularities and collusion with the architects, suitable action should be taken against them".

1.18. In a note dated 25 November, 1978, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have stated:

"Government have appointed a one-man Inquiry Committee headed by Shri N. D. Rajan, Chief Engineer (Vigilance), Central P.W.D. to look into the allegations. Its report is awaited."

1.19. From a copy of the Government Resolution dated the 25th April, 1978, it is seen that the one-man Inquiry Committee was required to give its findings and recommendations within a period of two months from the commencement of the Inquiry. From a copy of another resolution dated the 11th January, 1979, it is noticed that the inquiry Committee started its work from 4th September, 1978 and it was permitted to give its final findings and recommendations by 15th January, 1979. The Ministry had assured the Public Accounts Committee that a copy of the report of the one-man Inquiry Committee would be sent to them in due course. Again on the 12th April, 1979, the Ministry was requested to make available a copy of the Report together with the date when it was presented to Government as also the action taken thereon by the Ministry so far. The Ministry have informed on 17 April, 1979 that the one-man Inquiry Committee submitted its report to the Ministry on 6 December, 1978 and the same is under consideration.

1.20. Pursuant to the recommendation contained in paragraph 8.34 and 8.35 (Sl. Nos. 47 & 48) of the 73rd Report of the Public Accounts Committee (Sixth Lok Sabha), the Government had appointed a one-man Inquiry Committee on 25 April, 1978 to look into the allegations about the circumstances leading to cornering of over two hundred building projects, costing Rs. 3,22 crores, in universities and colleges in several States by two Delhi-based firms of architects and to determine if there had been any connivance on the part of any officials of the University Grants Commission. The Inquiry Committee is stated to have presented its report on 6 December, 1978. The Committee regret that despite the request made on 1 May 1978, the assurance given by the Ministry on 19 May 1978 and a communication addressed to the Ministry on 12 April 1979, the Ministry have not cared to furnish to the Public Accounts Committee for their perusal a copy of the report of the Inquiry Committee. The Committee would like that a copy of the Inquiry Committee report should be sent to them at the earliest. The Committee consider that a period of four and a half months is too long for the Government to take a decision on the report of the Inquiry Committee. They desire that Government should take decisions on the findings and recommendations in the Report promptly. The Committee would like to be informed of the follow-up action taken on the findings and recommendations of the Inquiry Committee within the next three months, i.e. by the end of July, 1979.

April 24, 1979.

Vaisakha 4, 1901 (S).

P. V. NARASIMHA RAO,

Chairman,  
Public Accounts Committee.

## CHAPTER II

### CONCLUSIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

#### Recommendation

One of the primary functions of the University Grants Commission is the determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities. In pursuance of this function, a Committee on Standards of University Education was appointed by the University Grants Commission in August, 1961. The Committee submitted its report in October, 1964. The Report of the Committee was considered by the University Grants Commission in May 1965. The University Grants Commission merely forwarded the report to the universities and the State Governments for suitable action. This perfunctory action of the University Grants Commission in regard to the report of the Committee on Standards came in for criticism by the Estimates Committee in their 52nd Report (Third Lok Sabha) (April 1966) who recommended that "the University Grants Commission should pursue recommendations of these expert committees with the State Universities and keep a record as to how many recommendations of each expert committee have been implemented." The Public Accounts Committee also, in their 114th Report (Fourth Lok Sabha) (1969-70) took note of the reply of the Ministry of Education that some of the recommendations of the Standard Committee were under various stages of implementation. Seven years after the last quoted report of the PAC, the Secretary, University Grants Commission has admitted before the Committee during evidence in September 1977 that no watch was being kept on the implementation of individual recommendations of the Standards Committee and that the University Grants Commission "only keep a watch on the schemes rather than on the original recommendation." The Committee cannot but deplore the scant regard shown by the University Grants Commission to the specific recommendations of the Standards Committee which it had itself appointed in pursuance of its basic objectives.

[S. No. 1 Appendix VII Para 1.21 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### Action Taken by the Ministry/Department

A report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Committee appointed by the University Grants Commission on stan-

dards of University Education is given below:—

### *Chapter I: Aims of University Education in India*

The Standards Committee has recommended that universities should ensure that they reflect and respond to the life of the people living around them. This is sought to be achieved through programmes of Adult Education and Extension. The University Grants Commission has already finalised the guidelines in this regard and proposals from universities and colleges are being processed in accordance with the guidelines and the national objectives.

The role of the university system has also been spelt-out in the paper "Development of Higher Education in India—A Policy Frame" prepared by the UGC and circulated to the universities and being implemented through various working groups.

The suggestions of the Standards Committee regarding updating and modernization of syllabi, extension of knowledge and skills to the community around the university and increasing provision by way of support for research and investigations have been implemented through concerted measures, especially during the last plan period.

### *Chapter II: Evaluation of Standards*

The Committee has not given a categorical answer to the question whether standards have deteriorated during the last 10 or 15 years and finds the picture one of 'light and shades'. It has commended the various steps taken by the UGC to make a definite contribution to improve facilities in the universities and colleges and pointed out that the resources placed at the disposal of the Commission have been far from adequate to deal effectively with this problem.

The Commission has from time to time drawn the attention of the Government of India to the inadequacy of resources placed at its disposal.

### *Chapter III: Admission Policy*

The Commission has stressed from time to time the need for adopted measures which will reduce pressures on the University system, such as, effective vocationalization at the secondary stage, delinking most of the jobs from degrees and changing the present recruitment policies which virtually make a degree a minimum qualification for any good job. It is for the Government to take necessary steps in this regard.

The facilities for correspondence courses, part-time courses etc. have already been augmented by the Commission, as recommended by the Standing Committee. Presently, 21 universities and one institution deemed to be university are offering correspondence courses for B.A./B.Com., M.A./M.Com./M.Sc. and B.Ed. degrees.

#### *Chapter IV: Courses of Study*

As recommended by the Standards Committee, the UGC has already constituted Standing Review Committees for continual study of university courses in the light of modern developments in the respective fields. This is a continuing exercise.

The subject-panels appointed by the UGC have completed their survey of the status of teaching and research in various disciplines. Various measures have also been taken by way of follow-up of the recommendations of the panels.

During 1976-77 and 1977-78, 28 regional workshops were organised in various disciplines to give effect to the recommendations of the panels regarding revision of syllabi and new thrust in teaching and research.

The programmes of seminars, conferences, refresher courses and workshops has also been augmented as recommended by the Standards Committee.

#### *Chapter V: Undergraduate Education*

The entire question of the reorganisation of courses at the undergraduate level has been reviewed by the UGC in the context of the new pattern of education. Guidelines for the purpose have been formulated and circulated to the universities for implementation. Emphasis in these guidelines is on up-dating of courses, diversification, flexibility, social responsibilities, relevance, inter-disciplinary approaches and practical orientation.

155 colleges have already been identified by the Commission to try out the new restructured courses with emphasis on rural development, field and project work and problems having local and regional bearing.

21

The suggestion of the Standards Committee for core-courses has also been incorporated in the guidelines. It has been suggested that the new curriculum should provide a set of broad foundation courses in the three broad areas of knowledge viz., humanities, social sciences and sciences and these together with applied studies/projects



and extension should be provided within 20 to 25 per cent of the time available for all studies in the three-year courses. The purpose is to create a greater awareness of oneself and of the social, cultural and natural environment.

The new pattern of education *viz.*, 12+3 has already been accepted and is being implemented by the states in a phased manner. At the first degree stage, universities have made provision for pass and honours courses, as suggested by the Standards Committee.

### *Chapter VI: Postgraduate Studies and Research*

The Standing Committee on Postgraduate Norms and Academic Centres at its meeting held on 13th March, 1974 considered the question of the quality of postgraduate education in the country in all its aspects. The Committee felt that while some expansion of postgraduate education was inevitable and necessary, it would have to be necessarily need-based and efforts be made to ensure quality of postgraduate education.

The norms for the purpose have been laid down and the assistance of the Commission is now linked with these norms.

The Commission has accepted the view that as far as possible postgraduate teaching should be concentrated in the university departments and that central facilities should be created wherever there are at least five colleges in a city. The State Governments have been advised to set up postgraduate centres on well-defined criteria, justified demand, need and careful planning.

The Commission has also suggested to the State Governments the need for carrying out surveys in order to determine the need for expanding postgraduate courses. These surveys have already been taken up by some states e.g., Madhya Pradesh.

The Commission has also been following the guidelines regarding the scope and role of university centres for postgraduate studies. Support is also being provided for pooling of resources by the colleges and university departments.

### *Chapter VII: Science Education*

The programme of organizing summer institutes for improving the teaching of Science has already been expanded, as suggested by the Standards Committee. Support for research in science has also been augmented.

Courses of study in science subjects are being reviewed from time to time as suggested by the Standards Committee.

The Commission has approved the establishment of science education centres at Madurai and Rajasthan universities in order to promote the teaching of science, innovative programmes at the university level, design and fabrication of tools required for science teachers, production of materials including text books, laboratory, manuals, etc.

The suggestion that Indian Scientists working abroad should be offered congenial conditions of work in India is being met through the scheme of visiting professors appointments. The following guidelines have been accepted by the Commission in this regard.

#### *Visiting Professorships*

- (a) A Visiting Professor should be an eminent scholar in his subject.
- (b) The maximum tenure of a Visiting Professor be one year and minimum three months.
- (c) The Visiting Professor be paid a honorarium upto Rs. 3,000 per month.
- (d) A suitable provision be made to enable the Visiting Professor to travel within the country for approved academic programmes and also for reimbursement of medical expenses, if any.

#### *Visiting Appointments*

- (a) The duration of visit should not be less than two weeks and should not exceed four months in a year.
- (b) The travel expenses would be met by the host institution.
- (c) In case of a person receiving his salary from the "parent institution", for the period of visit, the host institution would provide hospitality and honorarium not exceeding Rs. 1,000 per month.
- (d) In the case of a person not receiving his salary from his "parent institution" for the period of his visit the "host institution" would pay an honorarium not exceeding Rs. 2,500 per month.

Facilities for collaboration between Indian universities and universities abroad are sought to be augmented through bilateral links under the Cultural Exchange Programme.

#### *Chapter VIII: Improvement of Teaching*

The various suggestions regarding the improvement of teaching made by the Standards Committee are being achieved through sessional evaluation, details of which are given in Chapter X of Examination Reforms.

The Commission has already taken necessary steps towards the revision of the salaries of university and college teachers, residential accommodation for teachers and other measures like national fellowships, national lecturers, visiting professors, visiting appointments, etc.

Minimum qualifications for teachers of different categories have also been laid down, as suggested by the Standards Committee.

#### *Chapter IX: Medium of Instructions*

The entire position in this regard has been revised by the Working Group on the introduction of regional languages as media of instructions. According to information available with the Commission, 83 universities are using regional languages as media of instructions at various levels. The Commission proposes to invite proposals from the universities and colleges for support by way of adequate preparation for the switch over. However, the major part of support for the preparation of books, monographs, reference materials, etc., has been provided by the Book Production Boards/ State Granth Academies and the position will continue to be so.

The Commission has already formulated the guidelines for remedial courses. Necessary support for this purpose has also been provided.

An increasing number of teachers have been taken advantage of the training facilities at the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages at Hyderabad, as recommended by the Standards Committee.

#### *Chapter X: Examination Reform*

During the close of the Fourth Five Year Plan and in the current plan period, the Commission laid special emphasis on the imple-

mentation of various measures of examination reform. The main emphasis is on the following aspects of examination reforms.

- (a) Continuous sessional evaluation as a supplement to the present final examination.
- (b) The development of question banks in order to eliminate some of the shortcomings of setting up examination papers and as a means for revision and modernization of courses of study.
- (c) Introduction of grade system instead of the present marking system in order to increase reliability and bring about better comparability among different subjects.
- (d) Introduction of a semester system in order to have greater flexibility.

According to information available with the Commission, sessional evaluation at different levels has been introduced in 47 universities, 14 agricultural technical universities and 7 institutions deemed to be universities. Question banks have been or are being developed in 19 universities. Grading system is in operation at 31 universities/institutions. Semester system is in operation at 40 universities and five institutions deemed to be universities and all the agricultural and technological universities.

### *Chapter XI: Colleges*

The question of formulating conditions for the evaluation of colleges is being referred to a Working Group. This will be done as part of long-term planning but otherwise the present policy is that no new college should be established in the next plan period, except in tribal areas. This view has already been brought to the attention of universities.

The Commission has laid down the guidelines for assistance to autonomous colleges, as recommended by the Standards Committee. Autonomous status has already been granted to certain colleges of the Madras and Madurai universities.

The suggestion that universities should set up a Centre under their own auspices to serve as a pace setter for other colleges has also been implemented.

The recommendation that the Government should meet 90 per cent of the deficit of all colleges, as in the case of the colleges of Delhi University, is for the Government to implement.

### *Chapter XII: Organisation of the University*

The question of the governance of universities has been gone into by the Gajendragadkar Committee and the Sen Committee. These recommendations are taken into consideration at the time of processing proposals for the establishment of new universities.

### *Chapter XIII: Maintenance and Coordination of Standards*

The Standards Committee has observed that the U.G.C. has dealt with the problem of university autonomy with great tact and wisdom. The Commission has continued to do so.

The Standards Committee has suggested that the academic activities of the U.G.C. such as holding of seminars and conferences, appointment of review committees, setting up of Centres of Advanced Study, etc. need to be strengthened further. This has already been done.

The Standards Committee has suggested that the present outlay on higher education should be increased sufficiently. The Commission agrees with this view but it is to be implemented by the Govt of India.

The Standards Committee has also suggested strict control by the Central Government on the establishment of new universities. This is now being done.

(Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5  
dated 31-3-79).

### **Recommendation**

1.22. The Report of the Education Commission, appointed in 1964, was submitted in June, 1966. The report *inter alia* contained suggestions and recommendations regarding determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities. The University Grants Commission appointed an Implementation Committee (Kothari Committee) to process the recommendation of the Education Commission. This Committee met in May 1967. Meanwhile, a conference of Vice-Chancellors was convened in September, 1967. It also considered the implementation of the recommendations of the Education Commission. The decisions taken at the May-1967 meeting of the Implementation Committee and the recommendations of the conference of Vice-Chancellors were placed before the University Grants Commission in

October and November 1967. Thereafter neither the Implementation Committee met nor any systematic watch was kept on the implementation of the recommendations of the Education Commission. In regard to the fate of the various recommendations of the Education Commission, the Commission informed Audit in October 1976, that the recommendations of the Education Commission had been "taken into account in finalising the Fourth Five Year Plan."

1.23. The Committee take adverse notice of the slipshod manner in which the suggestions and recommendations by the Education Commission at considerable labour and expense spread over more than 2 years, were handled by the University Grants Commission. The minutes of the meeting of the Implementation Committee in May 1967 are a vivid testimony of the perfunctory and insubstantial approach of the Commission to the report of the Education Commission. The Committee desire the Ministry of Education and University Grants Commission to devise methods of systematic progressing of the recommendations of various expert bodies appointed by the Government to go into various aspects and problems of higher education. No doubt it is a stupendous task as the monitoring would have to be done university-wise, but this work has to be undertaken if the appointment of the various expert Committees has to be purposeful and an impact has to be made on university education.

[S. No. 2 and 3 Appendix VII Para 1.22 and 1.23 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action taken**

A report on the Implementation of the recommendations of the Education Commission (1964—66) is given below:

#### *Chapter I: Education and National Objectives*

The action taken by the UGC is spelt out in our reply to para 1.21.

#### *Chapter II: Educational System; Structure and Standards*

As indicated in reply to para 1.21, the guidelines for the reorganisation at the university stage in the context of the new pattern of education have already been formulated and circulated to the universities.

#### *Chapter III: Teacher Status*

The position as indicated in reply to para 1.21.

#### *Chapter IV: Teacher Education*

The Panel on Teacher Education advises the Commission regarding the maintenance and improvement of the standards of teacher education.

The U.G.C. also appointed a Joint Consultative Committee with NCERT on Teacher Education. The Committee has finalised its recommendations regarding admission, recruitments, duration of the courses, and contents of courses. These have been circulated to the universities for implementation.

#### *Chapter V: Enrolment and Manpower*

The forecast of manpower needs and requirements done by the Education Commission has been found to be wide off the mark. This is true of manpower forecasting in various other countries. Nevertheless the Commission has advised the universities and State Governments to carry out a survey of the educational needs of the area before starting new institutions. The U.G.C. grants are also being linked with the results of the survey.

#### *Chapter VI To X:*

The U.G.C. is not concerned.

#### *Chapter XI: Higher Education: Objectives and Improvements*

The measures taken by the U.G.C. for the improvement of standards of teaching and research in the universities and colleges are outlined in the reply to para 1.21.

The recommendations of the Education Commission regarding the establishment of major universities has not been found to be acceptable.

In the approach to development for the sixth plan the Commission has decided to group universities under three categories on the basis of profits of individual departments. These categories are well-developed university, developing universities and universities which have the potential to reach the well-developed stage in the next five years. The main attempt will be to see that (a) in the case of well developed departments, the general plan assistance is utilized to a very minimal level and recourse is taken to obtain assistance for their activities from the various quality improvement programmes and research support available from the Commission, on the basis of

well defined and time-bound programmes with specific academic accountability, (b) to make available to the developing departments necessary amounts to bring their facilities and activities to an optimum level essential for maintenance of proper standards and (c) to identify from amongst the developing departments, a few departments which are in a stage of development and have the potential to become fully developed over the next five years with the help of some critical inputs and academic guidance. A cluster of such departments could be considered for intensive development at an appropriate stage during the current plan period as envisaged in the approach paper.

The recommendations of the Education Commission regarding the provision of students services are being implemented with provision for scholarships, fellowships and assistance towards the construction of hostels, improvement or establishment of study centres, student homes non-resident students centres, students aid fund, book banks, play fields and gymnasia, etc. It has also been decided to provide assistance for play-fields, gymnasia and canteens.

#### *Chapter XII—Higher Education: Enrolment and Programmes*

The measures taken by the Commission regarding expansion of facilities, selective admissions, part-time and own-time education, postgraduate education and research and reorganization of courses are outlined in reply to para 1.21.

#### *Chapter XIII—Governance of Universities*

Reference has already been made to the report of the Committee on Governance of Universities and action taken thereon in reply to Para 1.21.

#### *Chapter XVI—Science Education and Research*

The measures taken by the U.G.C. for the promotion of Science Education and research are outlined in reply to para 1.21.

#### *Chapter XVII—Adult Education*

The programme of Adult Education and Extension has been taken up by the U.G.C. in a big way. The guidelines have been formulated and circulated to the universities and colleges (Annexure--I).

Proposals received from the universities and colleges are being processed according to these guidelines. Efforts are also being made



towards the greater involvement of the universities and colleges through seminars and workshops.

2. Government and the University Grants Commission have noted the observations of the Public Accounts Committee regarding systematic progressing of the recommendations of expert bodies and efforts will be made in future to devise time-schedules for implementation of recommendations of such bodies.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5, dated 31-3-1979]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee find that although the PAC had recommended as far back as 1970 for the appointment of a Committee to review the work done by the Commission so far and to chart out a course of action for the future and the Government intimated the acceptance of the recommendation in a note sent to the Committee in December, 1970, it took the Government 3-1/2 years to set up the Review Committee (August, 1974). It took the Review Committee about 2-1/2 years to submit its report (February, 1977). It took another 5 months for the Government to lay the report before Parliament and to appoint an Empowered Committee to process the recommendations of the Review Committee (July, 1977). The Committee are informed that no time-limit has been laid down for the Empowered Committee to finalise action on the various recommendations of the Review Committee. Despite the assurance given by the Secretary, Ministry of Education and Social Welfare during evidence in September, 1977 that "in two months' time the report (of the Empowered Committee) will be finalised", the Committee were informed on 10th April, 1978 that the report of the Committee is still "under submission to Government." The Committee are distressed at the tardy pace of implementation of the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee which was accepted by Government as far back as 1970. They would like Government to prescribe a time-bound programme for implementation of such of the recommendations made by the Review Committee as are accepted by Government.

[Sl. No. 4 Appendix VII Para 1.41 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted for compliance.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5, dated 23-12-1978]

### Recommendation

The Committee find that the University Grants Commission has been functioning without rules and regulations on some of the very important aspects of its working. For instance, the Committee find that the draft rules under Section 25(2) (e) and (f) requiring the universities to furnish returns and information relating to (i) financial position of the university, (ii) studies undertaken in the university, and (iii) all the rules and regulations relating to the standard of teaching and examination in that university in respect of the various branches of learning, proposed by the Commission as far back as in 1974 are still under discussion between the various Ministries and have not yet been notified. The Committee are surprised that even though this power was available to the Central Government right from 1956, the proposal to frame rules was mooted only in 1974 and that the rules are yet to take a concrete shape. The Committee would like Government to finalise and notify these rules without further delay.

[S. No. 6 Appendix VII Para 1.57 of 73rd Report of  
PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

Although the power to make rules under Section 25 of the UGC Act is vested in the Central Government, in actual effect the University Grants Commission submits proposals to the Government for making rules under the various clauses of this Section as and when the need for framing such rules arises. This is a continuous process. The University Grants Commission has been asked to submit to the Government proposals for framing rules under clauses (2) (e) and (f) of Section 25 and as soon as the proposals are received, the same would be examined and notified.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5,  
dated 23-12-1978]

### Recommendation

The Committee also find that some of the rules and regulations issued by the Central Government|U.G.C. are more than 10 years old. They would like the Central Government|Commission to examine these rules in the light of experience and amend or revise them, if necessary.

[S. No. 9 Appendix VII Para 1.60 of 73rd Report of  
PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

The recommendation of the Committee is noted for compliance. A Committee consisting of representatives of University Grants Commission, concerned Ministries and Comptroller and Auditor General of India has been constituted to review the rules.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5,  
dated 25-11-1978]

### Recommendation

The Committee find that whereas in 1969-70, the non-plan and plan payments of the Commission were of the order of roughly Rs. 9 crores and Rs. 15 crores respectively, in 1975-76, these have risen to Rs. 30 crores and Rs. 29 crores respectively. There has been thus over the years a disproportionate increase in non-plan expenditure *vis-a-vis* the plan payments. The Committee recommend that the Commission should examine how best to reduce the non-plan expenditure to keep it to the minimum.

[S. No. 10 Appendix VII Para 2.8 of  
73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

By its very nature, the development expenditure on education has a considerable component of recurring items. At the end of each plan period, therefore, a substantial part of plan expenditure is carried over to non-plan.

Revision of scales of pay of the staff of the University Grants Commission and of the teaching and non-teaching staff in Central Universities together with periodical increase in allowances payable to them at the rates applicable to the corresponding Central Government employees is a major contributing factor towards increase in non-plan expenditure.

Every effort is made not to increase the non-plan expenditure and the Universities are advised to follow the instructions issued by the Government of India for exercising economy in non-plan expenditure. It may be added that whereas plan payments are for a specific period, the non-plan expenditure is an effect of the cumulative recurring expenditure approved over successive Plans. The Commission has however decided that while determining the development grants of the Universities, the facilities available under

non-plan should be kept in view, and even, if necessary, the development requirements could be met by suitably adjusting the posts provided under non-plan.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5,  
dated 25-11-1978]

### Recommendation

The Committee were informed during evidence that the expenditure under the cultural and bilateral exchange programme was intended to cover foreign tours of "individual professors and teachers going in connection with their research work and exchange programme between India and other countries" as also that "incurred by us for the foreign professors coming to India and visiting our universities". It was further stated during evidence that "this expenditure includes the items covered under the cultural agreements the Government of India has with different countries and the programmes as far as it relates to the University system is handled by the University Grants Commission." From the information furnished to the Committee, they observe that Chairman and Secretary as also Deputy Secretary and Administrative Officers of the University Grants Commission have been regularly undertaking tours under this programme. The Chairman of the University Grants Commission has, since 1973-74 and upto December 1977, undertaken as many as 13 tours, varying from 2 to 4 per year. During the same period, the Secretary UGC has been on foreign tours on as many as 11 times. The Committee expresses its disapproval to the frequent tours undertaken by the University Grants Commission Secretariat officers at Commission's expense. The Committee would like the Ministry of Education to lay down guidelines for the professors and teachers undertaking foreign tours under the cultural and bilateral exchange programmes ensuring that no single person is allowed to take undue advantage under the programme at the cost of the other equally, if not more, qualified and competent persons. In so far as the non-academics are concerned the tours should be drastically curtailed. The Committee desire that the details of tours should be appended in the Annual Report of the Commission.

[S. No. 11 Appendix VII Para 3.8 of  
73rd Report of PAC (Sixth Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted for compliance.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5,  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

4.20. It has been admitted during evidence and in written replies by the representatives of the Ministry of Education and of the University Grants Commission that the initial scheme-wise allocation (within the ceiling of Rs. 115 crores provided to the University Grants Commission for the Fourth Plan period) drawn up by the Secretariat of the Commission at the instance of the Commission was not formally approved by the Commission before being transmitted to the Ministry of Education on 1 July, 1970. It is also a fact that subsequent changes in the allocation for teacher education and adult education for the Fourth Plan period were also not specifically approved by the Commission. The Committee consider that in such important matters as the allocation of funds for different schemes during the Plan period, specific approval of the Commission should have been taken not only at the initial stage but also every time it was proposed to effect a change in the allocation for individual schemes in the light of the progress of the scheme and its capacity for absorption of funds during the remaining part of the Plan period.

[Sl. No. 12 Appendix VII Para 4.20 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted for compliance. This would also be taken into account while framing the regulations for delegation of powers under Section 27(1) of the University Grants Commission Act.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O. M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee note that although the University Grants Commission Act, 1956, has been in operation for more than 20 years, the Commission has not made and notified regulations under Section 27 of the Act delegating its powers to the Chairman, Vice-Chairman or any of its officers. They also note that in the absence of these regulations, the Chairman, the Secretary and other officers of the commission are exercising the powers under delegation by a resolution of the Commission adopted way back in 1956.

An interesting feature of this resolution of 1956 is that the Commission has, by means of this resolution, authorised the Chairman to exercise "all powers and do all acts and things which may be exercised or done by the Commission." The resolution also provides that the Chairman may delegate to Secretary or other officers of the Commission "such of the powers and the functions exercisable by him or under the University Grants Commission as he may deem necessary". The Committee are informed that the Chairman has, from time to time delegated to the Secretary and other officers of the Commission powers and functions exercisable by him or under the University Grants Commission Act. The Committee feel that by means of resolution of 1956, the University Grants Commission have, by and large abdicated their statutory powers, functions and responsibility in favour of the Chairman and, under his delegation, the Secretary and other officers of the Commission. The Committee feel that this position is not only far from satisfactory but also against the express intentions of the University Grants Commission Act. The Committee would like the Ministry of Education and the University Grants Commission to carefully frame and notify regulations under Section 27 of the Act ensuring proper exercise by the Commission themselves of the powers and functions assigned to them under the Act.

[S. No. 13 Appendix VII Para 421 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(Six Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The Commission's office has prepared draft regulations under Section 27(1) of the UGC Act. These regulations are now being vetted by a Committee consisting of the following:

1. Chairman, UGC.
2. Vice-Chairman, UGC.
3. Prof. M. V. Mathur,  
Director,  
National Staff College for  
Educational Planners & Administrators,  
New Delhi.
4. Shri S. N. Pandita,  
Joint Secretary,  
Ministry of Education & Social Welfare

5. **Shri Kamlesh Sharma,**  
**Joint Secretary,**  
**Department of Personnel &**  
**Administrative Reforms.**

As soon as the Committee has finalised its recommendations the same would be placed before the Commission and then sent to the Government of India for concurrence before the regulations are notified.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5,  
 dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

From the foregoing information and evidence, it is clear that during the Fourth Plan period, the UGC did not have a system of periodical appraisal of the progress of the Plan schemes in the sense of critical review of achievements in regard to various plan schemes with reference to targets, whether firm or notional. The Commission's Secretariat has been, on the request of the Planning Commission, compiling and forwarding to the Planning Commission data and information on the progress of plan schemes from time to time on the format suggested by the Planning Commission. At no stage the Commission had an opportunity to formally consider and discuss these 'reviews'. The Committee also note the position taken by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare that the concept of targets "did not seem realistic/useful", that the Commission did not lay down any physical targets to be achieved in the Fourth Plan period and that "no targets can be laid down in advance for the number of books, items of equipment etc." The Committee regret that the UGC did not care to evolve a regular system of appraisals of the various schemes launched during the Fourth Plan period, so as to inform itself of the impediments in the way of implementation of the schemes for taking corrective measures. The Committee have, later in this report, pointed out the shortfalls in the achievement of targets on the basis of which funds were made available to the Commission. At this stage the Committee would only like to point out that had the Commission kept a firmer grip on the implementation of the various programmes undertaken during the Fourth Five Year Plan, the achievements

would have been far more impressive than what actually have been.

[S. No. 14 Appendix VII Para 5.17 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

On 18th October, 1978, a directive has been issued by the Central Government to the University Grants Commission under Section 20 of the UGC Act, 1956, *inter-alia*, directing it to undertake a comprehensive review of the various programmes being implemented by them and the impact that they have made on the fulfilment of the statutory responsibilities of the Commission, namely, determination and maintenance of standards of teaching, examination and research in universities. An objective of this review would also be to identify a number of schemes which are peripheral or which have not registered any impact on the maintenance and improvement of standards of university education to discontinue them.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5,  
dated 23-12-78]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee are informed that during the Fifth Plan period the Commission have introduced the system of appraisals of the Plan Schemes and one such appraisal was done in December, 1976. They are also informed that each year the budget estimates are considered by a sub-committee of the Commission which considers them with reference to the progress of the scheme and recommends the budget estimates therefore. The estimates, as approved by the sub-committee, are thereafter considered and adopted by the UGC formally. The Committee trust that a sub-committee of the UGC which examines these estimates with reference to the progress of the schemes, would apply its mind to the progress of the schemes, and report to the Commission any laxity in physical performance for timely and corrective action.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5,  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

Accepted.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7 3/78-U. 5  
dated 23-12-78]



### Recommendation

The Ministry have sought to explain to the Committee the sizeable shortfall in expenditure during the Fourth Plan period (1969-74) against plan allocations on "Quality improvement and other special programmes" (49.2 per cent) differently at different points of time. They informed Audit in December, 1976 that since "the bulk of the universities and colleges are still not having minimum required physical infrastructure facilities... a major portion is made available to these institutions to build up physical facilities." During evidence given before the Committee in September, 1977, it was stated by the Chairman, UGC that the reasons for "some delay in the expenditure on quality improvement programmes" was that "the Commission carried out a careful review of all these special programmes and therefore, some time was taken in reformulating some of these programmes". The Secretary of the Commission attributed the delay during evidence, to "delay between the initiation and response from the universities and colleges". In a subsequent written note received in January, 1978, the Ministry have, justifying the excess expenditure on general development programme at the expense of quality improvement and other special programmes, stated that "the basic minimal requirements for the development of the various departments in the universities/colleges etc. could not be neglected" and explained further that "the expenditure on these (quality improvement etc.) schemes could not keep pace with the allocations made due to various factors." It is also stated in the note that the fact of the shortfall in expenditure on quality improvement etc. programmes came to notice first in October, 1972. As regard action taken thereafter, the note says that "the Commission reviewed the progress of these programmes from time to time through various expert/standing committees and took necessary measures for effective implementation of the various programmes."

[S. No. 16 Appendix VII Para 5.35 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 31-3-79]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee are unable to appreciate the plea advanced by the Ministry that excess expenditure on general development programme at the expense of quality improvement programme was due to the need to build up physical infrastructure facilities in universities and colleges. The Committee feel that the higher allocation for general development programmes already reflected this need and in any case, if further emphasis was to be placed on the building up of infrastructural facilities in universities and colleges the allocation therefore should have been revised upwards at the time of plan appraisal in 1972.

[S. No. 17 Appendix VII Para 5.36 of 73rd Report of PAO  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The observation of Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 31-3-79]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee are also unable to appreciate the position taken by the Ministry that the expenditure in the form of grants released to universities and colleges "depends upon the progress of implementation of various projects and not on the provision made in the plan/annual budget" as this view would make the entire system of planning and budgeting not only in respect of higher education but of all developmental programmes, nugatory. The implementation of the various projects and schemes has to be oriented to achieve the plan targets and budgetary provisions therefor.

[S. No. 18 Appendix VII Para 5.37 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

Noted. Efforts will be made to ensure that the implementation of the plan projects is according to schedule and the budgetary provisions will be phased accordingly.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 23-12-78]

### Recommendation

The real reason for the neglect of the quality improvement and other special programmes appears to the Committee to be the lack of systematic progressing of these programmes by the UGC and delays in its appraisals and reformulation in the light of experience. Another important reason for excess expenditure on general development programmes, the Committee feel, was that money given for buildings, staff, equipment, books and journals could be easily spent without much scrutiny at the Commission's level, whereas appropriation of grants for quality improvement and other programmes needed expertise and effort on the part of the Commission, the universities and the colleges to formulate and implement the schemes. The admission by the Secretary, Ministry of Education that "to improve quality is extremely difficult but to expand is quite easy" is quite significant in this connection. The Committee also take note of the analysis made by the Review Committee in their report that the percentage of grants made by the UGC during the Fourth Plan period for "capital expenditure on buildings and hardwares" against the total UGC grants was as high as 53 percent.

[S. No. 19 Appendix VII Para 5.38 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 31-3-79]

### Recommendation

The Committee need hardly emphasise the importance of quality improvement and other special programmes as it is through these programmes that the UGC can accomplish its object of promoting and coordinating university education and disseminating and maintaining standards of teaching and examination and research in the universities. The Committee, therefore, recommend that at least from now on the Commission should appreciate better their responsibility in this regard and so direct its activities as to make for accelerated effort by universities and colleges in the field of

quality improvement and other special programmes. The Committee were glad to hear from the Chairman, UGC that now the UGC had decided that in any allocation to colleges the components for building should not be more than one third and that proportions have also been laid down for other activities. The Committee would like the Commission to ensure that universities and colleges are given clear-cut guidelines in regard to each of these schemes and afforded all assistance and expertise needed by them to formulate concrete programmes under the various schemes. After these programmes are received by the Commission, expeditious action should be taken to process, scrutinise and sanction these programmes. A contemporaneous watch should be kept on the implementation of the programmes and there should be a system of high level periodical appraisals to review the progress of these programmes. Timely action should be taken to remove difficulties in the implementation of the programme, if any found during periodical appraisals.

[S. N. 20 Appendix VII Para 5.39 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

Accepted.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 23-12-78]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee find that out of the development grants totalling Rs. 165.39 crores released by the UGC during the seven-year period from 1969-70 to 1975-76, the share of Central Universities and Deemed Universities was 27.2 per cent against 46 per cent share of all the State Universities put together. It was explained that excessive expenditure on Central Universities was on account of exclusive features such as grants paid for (i) the medical colleges and hospitals attached to two Central Universities, (ii) Campuses development and Student amenities, and (iii) schemes having assistance on cent per cent basis in the case of Central Universities and sharing basis in the case of State Universities. From the information furnished by Government, it is revealed that even if we exclude from the total grants paid to the Central Universities and Deemed Universities the grants on account of the above three factors, out of grants totalling Rs. 110.65 crores made to the Central Universities, Deemed Universities and State Universities, the share of Central and Deemed Universities was 41 per cent against 59 per

cent of the State Universities, although the number of Central/Deemed Universities was only 10 as against 104 of State Universities. Development grants made during the same period to Delhi Colleges have similarly been on the high side as compared to grants to 'other colleges'. Out of development grants totalling Rs. 37.92 crores to all the colleges, about 10 per cent (Rs. 3.06 crores) went to Delhi Colleges alone.

6.18. The Committee disapprove this inequitable distribution of grants considering the fact that the student coverage of State Universities and 'other colleges' is much wider than that of Delhi Colleges. The Committee have noted the reasons advanced by the Ministry for low intake of development grants by the State Universities and 'other colleges' during 1974-75 and 1975-76 and also the measures taken by the UGC in the Fifth Five Year Plan to augment their intake. They would like UGC to play a positive role in creating conditions in which it should be possible for the State Universities and Colleges to take advantage of the facilities of development grant from the U.G.C. in greater measure than hitherto.

[S. Nos. 21 & 22 Appendix VII Paras 6.17 & 6.18 of 73rd Report of PAC (8th Lok Sabha)]

#### Action taken

#### 6.17 and 6.18.

Of the 115 Universities including institutions deemed to be Universities, twenty-one Agricultural Universities receive their development grants from State Indian Council of Agricultural Research. Similarly, out of the ten State Universities which were established after the introduction of Section 12A of the University Grants Commission Act, seven have not been declared fit to receive grant from the University Grants Commission. Even the remaining three Universities which were declared fit, were not paid development grant by the University Grants Commission as the State Governments had not fulfilled their commitments.

The figures of comparative percentage of grants received by the State Universities *vis-a-vis* Central Deemed Universities, as determined by the Committee, may not therefore reflect the correct position.

The University Grants Commission has since evolved a procedure by which the State Universities and Colleges would be in a better position to take advantage of various programmes of development for which assistance is given by it. All the affiliating universities have been advised to set up College Development Councils to formulate proposals for development of colleges. Assistance

for setting up these Councils would be provided on 100 per cent basis. The Commission is also releasing basic grants for purchase of books and equipment to all eligible colleges through universities to which they are affiliated. A number of programmes have also been sanctioned to State Universities outside the ceiling allocations so that some of the pressing development needs of the State Universities and Colleges would receive further assistance from the Commission.

The main difficulty for most of the State Universities and Colleges in taking advantage of Commission's development programmes has been the difficulty for providing matching share. In the Joint discussions with State representatives, Planning Commission, University Grants Commission and the Ministry of Education, which will be organised soon, these difficulties will be sorted out. The universities are also organising the conferences of the Principals of Colleges, at which the programmes initiated by the Commission are explained, and the colleges assisted to prepare these proposals. The University Grants Commission is associated with these conferences. Further the development programmes of Universities and Colleges are also brought to the notice of the State Governments concerned and even when Visiting Committees assess such programmes, representatives of State Governments are also associated. All these are expected to help in creating conditions under which it should be possible for the State Universities and Colleges to take maximum advantage of the development programmes of the Commission.

The position regarding payment of development grants to Delhi Colleges *vis-a-vis* other colleges has considerably changed as would be observed from the following tables:

	1975-76	1976-77 (Rs. in lakh)	1977-78
Delhi Colleges	37.16	41.39	61.69
Other Colleges	323.30	426.09	956.15

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### Recommendation

The Committee find that there has been considerable disparity in the quantum of grants released to State universities *inter-se*. During evidence it transpired that the main reason for the *inter-se* disparity in the release of grants to the universities is the application of the principle of matching grants whereby the release of grants from the University Grants Commission is conditional on a certain percentage of expenditure being met by the State Govern-

ments/management. The Committee would like Government to give a fresh look to this principle so as to modify it in such a manner that it does not act as a stumbling block for such universities and colleges in the States as are less advanced educationally and economically and are unable to take advantage of the facilities of development grants available from the University Grants Commission.

[S. No. 23 Appendix VII Para 6.31 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

As indicated in para 4 of the reply given to recommendations contained in paragraphs 6.17 and 6.18 of the Report of the Committee, the University Grants Commission proposes to organize very soon joint discussions with the State representatives, Planning Commission and the Ministry of Education to sort out the difficulties which the State Universities and Colleges face in taking advantage of the Commission's development programmes on account of the inability of State Governments to provide matching shares.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5  
dated 23-12-78]

### **Recommendation**

6.45. The Committee consider that it was principally wrong on the part of the UGC to have appropriated Plan funds to meet part of the maintenance expenditure of Delhi Colleges during the Fourth Plan period and of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to have acquiesced in this. The Committee do not agree with the explanation offered by the Ministry that "from the administrative and accounting points of view it did not seem feasible to maintain separate accounts for expenditure chargeable to Plan funds for the extended colleges schemes". The Committee have no doubt that if definite instructions had been given to the Delhi Colleges to maintain separate accounts for extended colleges schemes and evening shifts introduced by them and the grants were made conditional thereto, it should be possible for them to maintain the accounts accordingly. The Committee further note that of a total 44 colleges which were given grants for maintenance out of Plan funds as many as 22 colleges were not covered by any of the reasons advanced by Government for adopting this practice. This shows that the Commission had indiscriminately given maintenance grants to almost all the Delhi Colleges in existence during the Fourth Plan out of Plan funds and the arguments advanced are

far too facile to be accepted. The Commission and the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare also did not take the Planning Commission into confidence before taking such a step. The Committee take adverse notice of this unusual practice adopted during the Fourth Plan. The Committee hope that it would not be repeated in future.

[S. No. 24, Appendix VII, para 6.45 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

Noted for compliance. No maintenance grant to Delhi Colleges was paid out of Plan funds during the V Plan as no new colleges were started during this period.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee learn that at present the affiliation of colleges is entirely the responsibility of the respective universities and the rule therefor are prescribed in the various statutes under which the universities are established and the University Grants Commission has not laid down any rules, not even guidelines. The Committee on Governance of Universities was at present studying this question. The Committee desire that the UGC should make a study of the rules for affiliation of colleges prescribed in or under different university statutes and try to evolve guidelines for affiliation which should be commended to the various State Governments and universities for observance while granting affiliation to colleges in future.

[S. No. 25, Appendix VII, Para 6.54 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The working group on the Regulation of Student admissions with facilities for the weaker sections of society has also recommended that the University Grants Commission should study the conditions of affiliation prescribed by different universities in the country.

In pursuance of the above recommendation as also the recommendations in this paragraph, the Commission has decided to undertake a study of the conditions of affiliation. In this connection,



it may also be mentioned that in the proforma for the evaluation of colleges, as referred to in Para 6.78, information is already being collected with regard to the existing conditions of affiliation. This information along with the information now being collected from the colleges in reply to the questionnaire, referred to in para 6.78, would be evaluated and guidelines for evaluation of colleges formulated.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5 dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

Out of 1250 applications for Development Grants received by the Commission during the three years from 1974-75 to 1976-77, grants were released during this period to a total of 543 colleges only. Of the 543 colleges to which grants were released, as many as 483 colleges were given grants during 1976-77 whereas during 1974-75 and 1975-76 only 60 colleges were given such grants. The Committee have elsewhere in the report recommended the rationalisation of procedures of scrutinisation of applications for grants and laying down of time-limits for disposal of applications received from the institutions. The Committee would also like the Commission to maintain an even flow of grants to the colleges and try to avoid bunching towards last years of the plan period.

S. No. 28, Appendix VII, Para 6.64 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)

### **Action taken**

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5 dated 31-3-79]

### **Recommendation**

In view of the Committee no rationale or balance appears to have been observed in releasing grants to colleges as between different States or as between different universities, whereas in certain States almost all the colleges eligible for Development Grants were extended assistance during 1976-77, in other State even one-sixth of the colleges eligible for such grants were not accommodated. Similarly, there are wide differences in the number of colleges to which grants were released during 1976-77 as between different universities to which these were affiliated. This corroborates the observation made in the Audit para that there was wide

disparity in the grants released to the different colleges. The Committee would like the UGC to lay down guidelines for themselves with a view to bring in a measure of balance in release of grants to colleges as between different States and between different universities and try to minimise as far as possible, glaring disparities.

[S. No. 29, Appendix VII, Para 6.65 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The basis of release of grants to institutions is being reviewed by the University Grants Commission and appropriate procedures are being devised for the purpose.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5  
dated 23-12-78]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee note that the applications for grants from universities and colleges are scrutinised and processed in the Secretariat of the Commission at different stages. The Committee recommend that the procedure of scrutinisation of applications for grants should be rationalised and time-limits should be laid down for the processing of applications at each stage so as to streamline the work of the Commission. Suitable control mechanisms should be devised to ensure that the time-limits are actually adhered to in individual cases. Cases of delays in release of grants of one year or more from the date of receipt of application in the Commission should be brought to the notice of the Commission with reasons therefor for their considerations.

[S. No. 30, Appendix VII, Para 6.68 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

As indicated in reply to para 6.69, a system of centralised registration of the proposals received for assistance has been accepted. The Committee referred to in that para is also being asked to suggest a procedure so as to rationalise the procedure for processing of applications and release of grants.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee also recommend that the Commission should have a system of centralised registration college-wise, university-wise and state-wise, of all applications received for grants from universities/colleges. The applications should be passed on to the concerned divisions only after registration. It should be the responsibility of the registration authorities to keep a watch on the progress of applications and to bring to the notice of the appropriate authorities the delays in the disposal of cases beyond a determined period.

[S. No. 31, Appendix VII, Para 6.69 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee has been accepted and it is proposed to introduce this with effect from 1-4-1979 when the new Plan would be undertaken. A Committee is also being constituted to work out the mechanics of this and also to determine the additional staff that would be required to maintain effectively this control system.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee welcome the relaxation in rules relating to grants to universities and colleges in favour of the institutions in educationally backward areas with effect from Fifth Five Year Plan. They feel that if this relaxation had been introduced earlier, it would have by now made some noticeable impact on the development of educational facilities in the educationally backward areas. The Committee recommend that these relaxations in favour of institution in educationally backward areas should be continued and its impact assessed quinquennially.

[S. No. 33, Appendix VII, Para 6.82 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation made by the Public Accounts Committee is accepted.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee find that during the Fourth Five Year Plan period as many as 10 Universities/Deemed to be Universities were not visited by the Visiting Committees. Similarly, during the Fifth Plan period, the Universities/Deemed to be Universities not visited by these Committees so far number 10. This shows that the Commission did not have the benefit of expert appraisals of the Visiting Committees in respect of certain universities before deciding on grants to these Universities for various schemes. The Committee would like the Commission to place the system of Visiting Committees on a more regular basis and so organise their work that the Commission has the benefit of the Reports in respect of each of the Universities for their guidance in the matter of release of grants to the University concerned.

[S. No. 34 Appendix VII Para 7.19 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

Noted for compliance.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-3/78-U.5  
dated 31-3-1979]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee also find that during the Fourth Plan period the Visiting Committees visited 10 Universities for only one day each. This obviously is a very short time for the Visiting Committee to assess the financial needs of the University spread over fields covering a large number of Departments. The Committee would like to emphasise that the visits of the Visiting Committee should be meaningful and their Reports should throw up assessments made by experts after a thorough examination and scrutiny of the proposals submitted by the Universities. The number of days of visit should be adequate for the purpose.

[S. No. 35, Appendix VII, Para 7.20 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

Accepted.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 23-12-1978]

### Recommendation

The Committee are informed that it will not be possible for any Committee to spend more than 3 days in a University for the reason that it will be difficult for experts to spare time at a stretch for this type of 'voluntary' work. The Committee recommend that in view of the important role of the Visiting Committees and the weight attached to their recommendations in finalising the quantum of grants to the universities, the experts on the Visiting Committees need not be required to do their work on voluntary basis. It is worth examination whether the experts appointed on the Visiting Committees may be allowed some remuneration in the form of fees or honorarium for their services on the Visiting Committees on the analogy of the experts appointed by the Union Public Service Commission on the interview boards for various appointments. This would make for the experts discharging their functions as members of Visiting Committees more seriously.

[S. No. 36, Appendix VII, Para 7.21 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

Adequate number of days would be earmarked for the visit of the Committees depending upon the nature of proposals to be examined. It is not considered necessary at this stage to pay remuneration to the members of the Visiting Committees, since the academics have generally taken such work as part of their academic service to the total university system.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 23-12-78]

### Recommendation

The Committee also feel that the panel of names for appointment on the Visiting Committees should be drawn up in accordance with well-laid out criteria which should be brought to the notice of all the Universities. The panel should also be made a public document so that the academic circles are aware of the names included in it or of the changes made in it from time to time. It should also have a determined life circle. The Commission should adopt a method of rotation in the matter of associating experts with the Visiting Committees. It should not be left entirely to the Officers of the Commission attached to the Visiting Committee to finalise the names of experts on the Visiting Committees, in con-

sultation with the Divisional Heads and/or the Secretary of the Commission.

[S. No. 37, Appendix VII, Para 7.22 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The Commission would accept the recommendation of the PAC for drawing up a panel of experts for nomination on the Visiting Committees by the Chairman/Vice-Chairman. It may not be possible to appoint the members by rotation. It would, however, be ensured that the same members do not visit several universities. In case of emergency, the Chairman may appoint a person to serve on the Committee whose name is not included in the panel. The panel would exist for a definite period only.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 31-3-79]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee are informed that as soon as the Reports of the Visiting Committee are finalised these are placed before the Commission in the next meeting for their consideration. The Committee however, note from the information furnished to them by the Ministry that in many cases the time lag between the date of the Visit of the Visiting Committee and the date of consideration by the Commission of the relevant Report of the Visiting Committee, was as much as nearly 5 years. This indicates that either the report of the Visiting Committee could not be finalised earlier or it took the Commission a long time to consider the report of the Visiting Committee. In either case, the delay is indefensible. The Committee would like the Commission to lay down time limit for presentation of the report of the Visiting Committee and after it is presented, for its consideration by the Commission.

[S. No. 38, Appendix VII, Para 7.23 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

Accepted. It will be ensured that the reports of the Visiting Committee are finalised and considered by the Commission normally within a period of six months.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 23-12-78]

### **Recommendation**

The information furnished to the Committee also reveals that the consideration of the Reports of the Visiting Committee by the Commission has been, at least on some occasions in the past, rather perfunctory. To illustrate, at its meeting held on the 5th July, 1967, the Commission considered as many as 35 Reports of the Visiting Committees. The Committee have been told during evidence that the consideration of the Reports of Visiting Committee is now a regular feature in the Commission and it takes place during the first one or two days of the meeting of the Commission. Well known programme is fixed for the consideration of the Commission. The Committee trust that the Commission is now according due consideration to the Reports of the Visiting Committees.

[S. No. 39 Appendix VII Para 7.24 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

Noted.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 23-12-78]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee find that the question of the merger of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences with Post-Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research or provision of adequate hospital facilities to the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences is still under consideration. The Committee would like the question to be finally decided so that the University Grants Commission do not have to aid and maintain a truncated institution, which the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences at present is without clinical facilities.

[S. No. 42 Appendix VII Para 7.39 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The Calcutta University in September, 1978 has informed as follows:

“With reference to the D.O. letter No. F. 5-7/77 (D-3a) dated 21-8-78 from Shri N. Ramanujan, Assistant Secretary, UGC, to the Registrar, on the subject of providing

hospital facilities to the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, I am to inform you that the matter was pursued with the State Government but no final decision on the subject has yet been arrived at. It is, however, hoped that with the help of the State Government the different departments of the University College of Medicine will get the hospital facilities at the hospital attached to the Institute of Medical Education and Research."

The Commission while considering the Report of the V Plan Visiting Committee had, amongst other, resolved as follows:—

"The University and the State Government may take immediate steps to either merge the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences with the Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education & Research or provide adequate hospital facilities to the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences. The question of providing assistance to the existing departments in the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences as recommended by the Visiting Committee may be considered only after a decision is taken on this."

The matter is being pursued with the University.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 31-3-79]

#### **Recommendation**

7.53. The Committee find that the construction of a library building by Kashmir University originally estimated to cost a sum of Rs. 5 lakhs has remained incomplete although a sum of Rs. 58.40 lakhs has already been spent over this grandiose building upto September, 1976.

[S. No. 43 Appendix VII Para 7.53 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 31-3-79]



### Recommendation

The Visiting Committee of the Commission while assessing the Fifth Plan requirements of the University observed in November, 1974 that the building over which Rs. 58.40 lakhs had already been spent would, according to University estimates, need another 50 to 60 lakhs for its completion and when completed the building would be completely out of tune with the other buildings on the University campus or other University campuses in the country. The Visiting Committee had also indicated that the building was designed with a view to accommodating 20 lakh books, which no University, however old, possesses in the country or is likely to possess in the near future and that the building would also not be of great functional importance. It also stated that the building when completed would need centrally heating system which could cost another Rs. 11 lakhs for the first floor and mezzanine floor only. On the above observation the University Grants Commission decided in July, 1975 that the possibility of utilising a part of the library building for accommodating social sciences departments for which a provision of Rs. 12 lakhs were recommended by the Visiting Committee separately, could be examined and if necessary the amount utilized towards the construction of the library building. The Kashmir University agreed to this proposal.

[S. No. 44, Appendix VII, Para 7.54 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted for compliance.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### Recommendation

The Committee regret that at the time of agreeing in May, 1973 to make available Rs. 16.12 lakhs as its share in the construction of the library building of the Kashmir University, estimated to cost Rs. 50 lakhs, the UGC did not make a detailed examination of the need for the library building on such a grandiose scale. They also regret that despite the observations of the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee, grants totalling nearly Rs. 4 lakhs were released during the 5th Plan period to Kashmir University for the library building.

ding. Though the UGC has pegged its share at Rs. 16.12 lakhs, the fact remains that if the UGC had initially not acquiesced in the revised programme, the Kashmir University would, perhaps, not have launched this ambitious programme. The Committee are also averse to the principle of diversion of funds from one approved scheme to another, howsoever important. Now that the building is nearing completion, the Committee would like the UGC to ensure that it is fully and properly utilised.

The Committee hope that the UGC would hereafter be more cautious in extending assistance on such a large scale for building up infrastructural facilities in universities and, before agreeing to making available grants, ensure that the facilities proposed to be built up are realistic and by and large in line with similar facilities in other universities.

[S. No. 45 Appendix VII Para 7.55 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

This has been noted for future observance. It may be added that it has since been decided that in the next Plan period, the proposals for construction of buildings to be submitted by the universities for assistance from the Commission should indicate the areas to be provided and not only the likely funds to be used for the same.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 25-11-1978]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee find that the UGC's maintenance expenditure on the 5 Central Universities has during the last 7 years (1970-71 to 1976-77) increased almost three-fold—from Rs. 7.12 crores in 1970-71 to Rs. 19.50 crores in 1976-77. It seems that the University Grants Commission is allowing unbridled expansion in the activities of these universities which cost a direct burden on the Central Exchequer towards their maintenance. The Committee would like UGC to exercise greater prudence in agreeing to schemes for further expansion and development of these universities so that maintenance expenditure on these universities is kept within reasonable limits.

[S. No. 49 Appendix VII Para 9.22 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation made above would be kept in view while determining the development needs of the established universities. It would, however, be appreciated that in the case of newly established Universities viz., Jawaharlal Nehru University, North-Eastern Hill University and Hyderabad University, the Commission will have to examine their proposals on a different basis.

As already indicated in reply to Para No. 2.8, the Commission has since decided that while determining the development requirements of the Central Universities, the facilities available under Non-Plan be kept in view and it may be considered if some of the developmental needs of these universities could not be met by suitably adjusting the provision of teaching posts available under Non-Plan.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee are informed that UGC has not made any comparative study of the maintenance expenditure incurred by State universities *vis-a-vis* Central universities. The Committee would suggest that the Commission should compile figures of total grants received in each State University from the State Governments as well as from the Commission on an yearly basis and publish it in their Annual Report. This would enable the University Grants Commission to assess the financial resources of each university and may also help them in policy formulations.

[S. No. 50 Appendix VII Para 9.23 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted for compliance. The University Grants Commission proposes to undertake comparative study in respect of maintenance expenditure from the financial year 1979-80 onwards.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### Recommendation

From the information furnished to the Committee, they have not been able to glean out any reasonable explanation for special treatment being accorded to Delhi Colleges in the Central Exchequer meeting their maintenance expenditure, except that this practice was prevalent even prior to the setting up of the Commission when the Ministry of Education was meeting the maintenance expenditure of private colleges affiliated to the Delhi University. With effect from 1954, however, this work was transferred to the Commission. The justification given for this special arrangement that "in view of the special relationship of Delhi Colleges with the University" it is desirable that "the maintenance grant for both is paid from the same source" does not appear to be convincing. In this context, the Committee have noted that the maintenance expenditure during 1976-77 of 55 Delhi Colleges totalling about Rs. 9 crores, working out to be about 17 lakhs per college on an average. Considering the fact these colleges cater for only 2.4 per cent of the total student enrolment it is on the high side. The Committee also find that the maintenance grants to the Delhi Colleges have increased from 6.17 crores in 1974-75 to 9.10 crores in 1976-77. The Committee would like the UGC to exercise greater control over the escalation in maintenance expenditure of these colleges.

[S. No. 52 Appendix VII Para 9.25 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

Noted for compliance. It would be ensured that keeping in view the maintenance of standards of the colleges, the grants to these colleges are not unduly escalated.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### Recommendation

The Committee are informed that at present University Grants Commission does not compile information in regard to maintenance grant-in-aid received by the colleges affiliated to the State Universities. The Committee feel that there is need for introducing a measure of uniformity in the matter of maintenance grant-in-aid from the State Governments to the colleges affiliated to the State Universities. To this end, the Committee would like the University Grants Commission to collect, the grant-in-aid rules of different State

Governments/Union Territories, marshal out their differing features and, in consultation with the State Governments, endeavour to evolve a measure of uniformity in that regard. Unless the University Grants Commission takes an initiative in this matter, there would remain marked disparities in the financial viability of colleges affecting relatively their standards of teaching and research.

[S. No. 53 Appendix VII Para 9.26 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee is accepted. Steps have already been taken to collect the grant-in-aid rules of different State Governments and it is proposed to appoint a small Group to suggest the guidelines for the grant-in-aid rules that may be referred to the State Governments in the first instance.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee were informed during evidence that there is no system of obtaining specific approval of the Commission for revised allocation to the various activities of the UGC. The Committee feel that the Commission should not absolve itself of its responsibility for laying down *inter se* priorities as between different schemes and allocating funds for each scheme during the year in the light of the final allocations made by Government. They desire that changes in allocations to various schemes during the year should be made after specific approval of the Commission.

[S. No. 55 Appendix VII 10.15 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

This is accepted.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee find that there have been appreciable variations between the revised budget estimates and the actuals during

each year of the Fourth Five Year Plan. While the Committee consider that the conditional nature of grants by the Commission lends itself to possibilities of variations between the budget estimates and the actual expenditure, the Committee feel that with the experience built up by the Commission during the last 24 years of its working, it should be possible for them to forecast their expenditure a little more realistically. In the case of the maintenance grants, the element of uncertainty being much less, it should be possible for the Commission to bring in a more precise estimation of expenditure. The variation to the extent of 12.6 per cent between the revised estimates and actuals during 1973-74 in respect of grants to affiliated colleges of Delhi University is hardly justifiable.

[S. No. 56 Appendix VII Para 10.16 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 31-3-79]

#### **Recommendation**

From the figures of releases made during the year 1976-77 under plan schemes, it is seen that against the total releases during 11 months of the year amounting to about Rs. 52 crores, the releases during the month of March 1977 totalled Rs. 18.23 crores. Financial prudence calls for even spread out of releases throughout the year to avoid last minute rush. It is particularly important as the UGC do not have adequate supervisory inspecting agency and they accept the utilisation certificates from the recipient institutions on their own face value as conclusive proof of proper utilisation of grants. The Committee feel reassured that the UGC are seized of the problem and they hope that in future the releases of development grants would be evenly spread out.

[S. No. 57 Appendix VII Para 10.17 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

Noted for compliance. A copy of the circular D.O. letter dated 8-6-1978 addressed to all Vice-Chancellors on the subject is enclosed.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

## UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

SECRETARY

Bahadurshah Zafar Marg,

New Delhi-110002.

D.O. No. F. 2-21/78 (CP)

June 8, 1978.

Dear Vice-Chancellor,

As you are aware, the Commission allocates Development grants to Universities on Plan basis. The grants for various schemes are released in instalments on receipt of progress reports as laid down in the condition of grants both for Recurring & Non-recurring items. The UGC at its meeting held on 24th April, 1978 while receiving the statement of expenditure of the financial year 1977-78 *inter-alia* observed that a fairly large part of expenditure is incurred in the last quarter of the year and desired that the universities be requested to approach the Commission for release of funds as and when the expenditure is either incurred or committed and not wait till the end of the financial year.

Accordingly I shall be grateful if the university would keep the above observation of the Commission in view for sending progress report(s) of expenditure to the Commission.

With kind regards,

*Yours sincerely,*

Sd/-

(R. K. CHHABRA)

**Recommendation**

The Committee desire that the University Grants Commission should in consultation with Comptroller & Auditor General, revise the form of statement of accounts to provide for scheme/programme-wise break up of plan expenditure.

[S. No. 58 Appendix VII Para 10.21 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

**Action Taken**

The Committee constituted in pursuance of recommendation of para 1.60 is already being requested to look into this recommendation.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee regret that despite the simplification of procedures in regard to certificates of utilisation introduced in consultation with Audit in October 1970 and the appointment of an officer with effect from 11 September 1970 for undertaking visits to universities which are in heavy arrears with a view to taking remedial measures, the problem of outstanding utilisation certificates continues unabated. They note that as on 1 April 1977, utilisation certificates for grants paid upto 1974-75 were outstanding in respect of nearly 50,000 items, involving over Rs. 100 crores. They also note that despite adverse notice of the P.A.C. in their 114th Report (Fourth Lok Sabha) out of the outstanding report to the P.A.C. (1969-70) as many as 8568 items involving Rs 12.33 crores still remain outstanding even after a lapse of 7 years. It is clear that this matter has not been given the attention that it deserved. The Committee are not satisfied with the explanation that 'the Commission had limited man-power which was involved more in day-to-day work of sanctioning of schemes and proposals'. They would like the Commission to draw up a crash programme for liquidating the outstanding utilisation certificates.

10.54. The Committee also find that the utilisation certificates had not been issued till October 1976 in respect of grants paid during the period 1958-59 to 1962-63 to certain universities. The purpose for which the grants were released to these universities are stated to be post-graduate scholarships, salary of additional staff, improvement of salary scale, purchase of science equipment, books and journals etc. The items for which grants were paid could have been easily accounted for. Yet the Committee are informed that "D.O. correspondence had been initiated with the Vice-Chancellor or the defaulting universities concerned, requesting them to send the utilisation certificates". Since the universities involved are well-established universities with adequate secretarial manpower, the Committee are inclined to think that the Commission had been lax in pursuing the matter with the universities at a high level which they have now done. The Committee hope that the Commission will spare no effort in getting the utilisation certificates from the universities without any further delay.

[S. No. 59 & 60, Appendix VII Paras 10.55 & 10.54 of 73rd  
Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

Every effort is being made to clear the old outstanding items of grant. As recommended by Public Accounts Committee, a crash



programme is also being drawn up to ensure speedy settlement of all outstanding items. A Committee, with a representative of Comptroller and Auditor General of India, is being constituted to go into the whole problem and to suggest further measures for speedy settlement of all outstanding items.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee regard it as a serious matter that as on 1 April 1976, there was unspent plus balance of Rs. 11.44 crores in respect of certain universities. Even if the minus balance in respect of these universities as on 1 April 1976, is deducted, it would leave with the universities a net unspent balance of Rs. 5.77 crores. It is surprising that the Commission have no break up of these balances indicating the years from which these were outstanding. They are unable to appreciate the continuation of grants to these universities without having unspent plus balances fully accounted for and adjusted or refunded within a reasonable period. The Committee would like the UGC to devise an in-built system whereby they could call for the refund of the unspent balances if adjustments thereof against future grants are not possible within a reasonable period.

[Serial No. 61, Appendix VII Para 10.55 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation has been noted for compliance.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee are informed that the UGC is not requiring the colleges to furnish to them the information regarding the unspent balances lying with them in respect of grants made by the Commission as is being done by the universities. The Committee doubt the efficiency of the procedure whereby "any refund required to be made by the colleges can, if necessary, be adjusted against future grants payable to them". They would like the Commission to introduce a system whereunder colleges assisted by the Commission do forward to the Commission details of unspent balances against each grant at the end of the financial year. The procedure in regard to the refund

of unspent balances by the universities should also be made applicable to the colleges.

[S. No. 62, Appendix VII Para 10.56 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

Accepted. The work would be entrusted to the universities who would be requested to obtain such statement from the colleges and submit a consolidated statement to the Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 23-12-78]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee have been informed during the evidence that certificates of the Auditors is the only machinery which the Commission has for ensuring that the grant made for a particular scheme has been utilised for that purpose. This, the Committee feel, is not adequate. The Committee suggest that the Commission should not rely upon the certificates from the Auditor alone and should have, in addition, some other independent system also for ensuring that the funds released by the Commission are actually utilised for the agreed purpose.

[S. No. 63, Appendix VII Para 10.57 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

It is proposed to request the Directors of Higher Education/Collegiate Education in the States to ensure that the funds released by the Commission are actually utilised for the agreed purpose by the colleges. The assistance of the College Development Councils now being set up in the universities would also be availed of in this connection.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 23-12-78]

### **Recommendation**

The Commission have themselves been pointing out in their Annual Reports that they occasionally received complaints regarding mal-practices in the payment of salaries to teachers. The Committee are of the view that in its capacity as donor of development grants

to the colleges, the Commission can always take active interest on complaints received by it of mal-practices in the payment of salaries to teachers by the colleges which are receiving assistance from the Commission.

[S. No. 64, Appendix VII Para 10.58 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

It may be noted that some State Governments are now paying salaries to the teachers of the colleges directly and as such the mal-practices as pointed may not arise. However, where such instances are brought to the notice of the Commission, the matter would be taken up with the State Government concerned.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 23-12-78]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee learn that the UGC has not so far resorted to the provision of withholding grants to institutions under Section 14 of the UGC Act, even though the Commission have been finding it difficult to get information and documents such as utilisation certificates from universities and colleges. The Committee feel that for dealing with recalcitrant universities and colleges, UGC should be within their right to use the power available to them under Section 14 of the Act.

[S. No. 65, Appendix VII Para 10.59 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted for compliance.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

10.63. The Committee note that the UGC requested the universities in November, 1975 to forward certificates of assets by the end of March every year indicating that the inventories of permanent and semi-permanent assets created/acquired wholly or mainly out of the grants given by the UGC were being maintained and kept up-to-date. As the Commission have not been able to furnish to Audit

the names of institutions from which such certificates were still awaited the Committee are led to believe that no proper watch over receipt of such certificates is kept in the Commission. The Committee urge that a centralised register should be maintained for the purpose in the Commission and the proforma of the certificate should also include whether the assets are being utilised for the object for which these were acquired.

[S. No. 66 Appendix VII Para 10.63 of 73rd Report of  
PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action taken**

The recommendation made by the Public Accounts Committee is accepted. A Committee is being appointed to work out the details of implementation of this suggestion with effect from 1-4-1979. The Committee would also be requested to suggest the additional staff that may be required to implement this recommendation.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/79-  
U. 5 dated 25-11-1978]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee note that at present there are wide variations in the fees charged by different universities for Correspondence Courses at various levels. The Committee would like the UGC to compile full information in this regard from all the universities and persuade the universities to bring in a measure of uniformity in the matter of fees charged for the Correspondence courses at various levels.

[S. No. 69 Appendix VII Para 11.29 of 73rd Report of  
PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action taken**

A survey is being undertaken to find out the fees charged for different correspondence courses. The question whether any uniformity should be established would be considered thereafter.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-  
U. 5 dated 23-12-78]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee further note that the UGC had deputed expert committees to visit certain universities for evaluating their on-going programmes and for considering fresh proposals. Only 6 universities were visited by these committees between the period August, 1973  
717 LS—5.

and October, 1976. The Committee would like the Commission to constitute similar expert committees for visiting all other universities which have introduced Correspondence Courses, the schemes received from the universities should be got vetted by an expert committee.

[S. No. 70 Appendix VII Para 11.30 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action taken**

The recommendation of the Committee has been noted for compliance.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5 dated 25-11-1978]

#### **Recommendation**

11.31. The Committee learn that prior to 1972, different universities were having different guidelines in regard to Correspondence Courses and it was only in 1972 that guidelines were issued by the Commission for post-graduate and under-graduate courses. The current guidelines are stated to have been formulated on the basis of the recommendation of a Conference of Directors of Correspondence Courses in the light of actual experience. These guidelines were again reviewed by the Standing Committee on Part-Time and Own-Time Education at its meeting held on 12th November, 1977 which had made a number of suggestions. It is thus clear that the Commission had, earlier to 1972, not paid adequate attention to formulate well thought-out guidelines for the introduction of Correspondence Courses. The Committee feel that it should have been done before introducing the scheme as far back as 1962. The Committee hope that the Commission would consider the modification suggested by the Standing Committee on Part-time and Own-time Education expeditiously.

[S. No. 71 Appendix VII Para 11.31 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action taken**

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/79-U. 5 dated 31-3-79]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee find that the Education Commission in their report (1966) considering the value of the Centres of Advanced Study, found

it necessary "to strength and expend the UGC programme of the establishment of Centres of Advanced Study". It recommended fifty such Centres over the next five to ten years. It also recommended that the scheme should be extended to areas which were till then not covered in the scheme, namely, Agriculture, Engineering, Medicine and Modern Indian Languages. The scheme as implemented by the UGC, however, actually got reduced to "recognition" of university departments on the basis of a "comparative evaluation of achievements, facilities, potential, merits of plan of work of the departments". In the process of initial selection of university departments for evaluation, the universities themselves had no hand as no application was invited. The evaluation done by the respective subjects panels was placed before the Standing Committee whose recommendations were considered by the Commission. After approval of the Commission, specific proposals were invited from the selected departments. Expert committees were thereafter appointed to examine such proposals and final decision, including allocation of funds, was made on the basis of the reports of such committees. In the wake of these involved procedures and the several tiers of assessments providing ample scope for subjective considerations, it is hardly surprising that no new Centre of Advanced Study could be 'recognised' after 1968 and the number of such Centres remained pegged at 30 and with the withdrawal of recognition in 7 cases with effect from April 1974, it came down to 23.

[S. No. 73, Appendix VII Para 11.51 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action taken**

In consideration of the observations made by the Committee, it has been decided to ask the Standing Committee for Centres of Advanced Study to review the existing procedure.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/79-U. 5 dated 25-11-1978]

#### **Recommendation**

11.53. The Committee have been furnished the precise reasons why the Standing Advisory Committee for Centres of Advanced Study recommended in 1968 that "while it might not be possible and to a certain extent desirable, to recognise a large number of departments as Centres of Advanced Study, it would be worthwhile to provide special assistance to selected departments by identifying departments which have potentialities to build active schools in any particular branch as evidenced by their contributions to teaching

and research in recent years." The considerations on which the Commission accepted this recommendation of the Standing Advisory Committee in August 1968 have also not been furnished to the Committee. Similarly, it is not known why the Standing Committee recommended (and the Commission approved) that out of 33 departments recommended by the various Science Panels only 14 be recognised for support under the programme of Special Assistance and 19 might be considered for departmental research support.

[S. No. 75, Appendix VII, Para 11.53 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The Standing Committee has considered the recommendations given by the panels in respect of various departments for participation in the programme of Special Assistance and also departmental research support. The panels were asked to give its recommendations in the order of priority and considering the number of CAS/DSA already existing in the university, the Standing Committee took the decision to recommend some departments for Special Assistance Programme and others for Departmental Research Support, depending upon the stage of growth reached and ranking assigned by the panels also.

(Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F.7-9/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978.)

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee are thus unable to appreciate the distinction made as between the different departments for the purposes of grant under the scheme, particularly when the Commission has been unable to utilise the funds earmarked for the programme, as has happened during the Fourth Plan. The Committee recommend that the Commission should give a fresh look to the existing scheme in operation to see whether the creation of three distinct categories of departments eligible for various levels of grants from the UGC is conducive to the purposes of the scheme for Centres of Advanced Study as originally envisaged, and commended by the Education Commission.

[S. No. 76, Appendix VII, Para 11.54 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

In consideration of the observations made by the Committee, it has been decided to ask the Standing Committee for Centres of Advanced Study to review the existing procedure.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978.]

### Recommendation

The Committee have been told during evidence that the original allocation of Rs. 16 crores in the Fourth Plan for the scheme of Centres of advanced study was arrived at on the basis of a grant of Rs. 20-25 lakhs per centre for the number of centres assumed 'roughly'. No explanation was offered for arriving at the final allocation of Rs. 8 crores for the scheme. As regards the shortfall in utilisation of funds to the extent of 50 per cent, it was stated during evidence that it was mainly due to the fact that no new Centres came up in the 'Fourth Plan'. The Committee have elsewhere in the report already commented upon the *ad-hoc* manner in which allocations for new schemes have been made during the Fourth Plan period. The Committee would like to point out this as another instance of bad planning—financial as well as physical—by the Commission.

[S. No. 77, Appendix VII, Para 11.55 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

The observation made by the Committee have been noted for future guidance.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### Recommendation

The Committee note that the College Science Improvement Programme initiated by the UGC in 1970-71, was taken up at two levels (1) in selected colleges to improve the entire science faculty; and (2) university leadership projects in any one science subject in all the colleges affiliated to a university. The Committee find that in respect of the scheme at (1) above, the progress has been unimpressive. The Scheme was to be implemented in phases and the first phase was to end after three years of the launching of the scheme. There were, however, as many as 45 colleges which could not complete the first phase of the programme till September 1976 and extensions were being granted to them from time to time. The Committee recommend that the difficulties of the Colleges in completing the first phase of the programme should be considered by the Commission and ways and means should be found to get over them.

[S. No. 78, Appendix VII, Para 11.78 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

The Commission on the advice of the Standing Committee for COSIP and the views expressed in the four regional conferences



held in 1977, has decided to constitute State-wise Committees to assess the work done, review the programme and ensure proper and timely implementation of the schemes. The difficulties faced by the colleges in completing the programme would be considered by these State-level Committees and remedial measures suggested to help such colleges to get over the difficulties.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee also find that 79 colleges which started their activities upto 1971-72 were to complete their first phase of the programme by March, 1975 and were to be visited by Regional Committees for proper appraisal of the work done. The Regional Committees had, however, visited only 14 of these colleges in the West and North Regions between July and September, 1974. The Commission had not constituted any Committee to visit the remaining 65 colleges. It was revealed during evidence that the Commission was not able to set up Committees for proper appraisal of the work done by these 65 colleges because of "serious shortage of staff" and that it was decided to assess the work of these colleges on the basis of progress reports received from colleges. The Committee feel that the Commission should have made adequate timely preparations for constituting the requisite Regional Committees provided for the Scheme. If the assessment was to be made on the basis of reports, the original scheme should not have provided for the colleges being visited by the Regional Committees for assessment of work done under the scheme.

The Committee have been further informed during evidence that "the Standing Committee have now suggested that there should be State level Committees". The Committee recommend that the method and machinery for assessment of work done by colleges under the scheme should be clearly laid down on the basis of experience and it should be strictly adhered to.

[S. No. 79, Appendix VII, Para 11.79 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The State-level Committees referred to in para 11.78 would be requested to ascertain the difficulties of the colleges in completing the first phase of the programme and suggest measures to be taken to overcome the same.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

In regard to the University Leadership Project, the Committee observe that after initial selection, till March 1975, of 25 Departments relation to 14 universities no new department was brought under its purview till March 1976. However, against the total release of Rs. 93.50 lakhs during 1970-71 to 1974-75, a sum of Rs. 45.10 lakhs was released for the implementation of the Project. Further the Audit test check reveals instance of release of "on account" grants without taking into account progress of expenditure and/or large unutilised funds. The Committee emphasise that this quality improvement programme should be given adequate attention and its progress accelerated.

The Committee hope that greater financial prudence would be observed in releasing "on account" grants for implementing this scheme in future.

[S. No. 80-81, Appendix VII, Paras 11.80-11.81 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation is accepted for future action. However, this would be dependant on the total resources that be made available to the Commission in a particular plan period.

Noted for compliance.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee regret that the scheme of 'Basic Research Work for Industrial Development' conceived in May 1971 did not materialise till March, 1974 as a number of Committees working on individual projects for bringing about collaboration between Universities, National Laboratories and industries could not finalise their suggestion in this regard. It is, however, heartening that subsequent to 1974, a number of major research projects including a considerable number with research and development value and application potential have been launched on the recommendations of Science Panels of the Commission.

[S. No. 82, Appendix VII, Para 11.85 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 31-3-79]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee regard it as unfortunate that out of the final allocation of Rs. 4 crores for teacher education programme during the Fourth Plan, the actual utilisation was only Rs. 1.18 crores. The Committee are not convinced of the reasons advanced during evidence for this sizeable shortfall in utilisation that "it takes time to visit universities and give the reports" and that "universities have to consult State Governments". The Committee consider that these are normal processes which have to be undergone in regard to utilisation of all grants from the Commission. They, however, note the assurance given during evidence that "such a thing will not happen" in future.

[S. No. 83, Appendix VII, Para 11.93 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 31-3-79]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee are constrained to learn that against an allocation of Rs. 50 lakhs for Adult Education Programme during the Fourth Plan period, the actual expenditure was only Rs. 2 lakhs. This is symptomatic of the fact that the programmes launched by the Commission are not well-planned and the implementation thereof is lax. In this context, the Committee take special note of the remarks of the Ministry given in the communication explaining the reasons for shortfall in expenditure that "it is not the main objective of the Commission to achieve the final targets alone. The main objective is the proper utilisation of funds placed at the disposal of the Commission." The Committee need hardly point out that the objective of proper utilisation of funds could not be advanced as a valid *raison d' etre* for dismal failure in the achievements of plan objectives and programmes.

[S. No. 84, Appendix VII, Para 11.94 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 31-3-79]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee find that the recommendation of the Education Commission (1966) that the Inter-University Board of the University Grants Commission should take a lead in the matter relating to preparation of university level books by Indian authors was not specifically and separately considered by the University Grants Commission. It was considered by the Commission together with other recommendations relating to higher education. In the communication from the Commission to the Ministry of Education in October, 1967 in which the Commission had indicated its reaction to the recommendations of the Education Commission relating to higher education, there is no reference to the recommendation in question. It is thus clear that, as pointed out by Audit, this recommendation of the Education Commission was not specifically considered by the University Grants Commission.

The Committee also find that the scheme of preparation of university level books by Indian authors was initiated by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare as a supplement to the programme launched in 1968 of production of university level books in Indian languages and it was only in August, 1969 that definite proposal in this behalf was approved by the Ministry of Education and formally communicated to the UGC in September, 1969. The scheme itself could be implemented only after March, 1971. The Committee regret that the scheme for preparation of university level books by Indian authors suggested by the Education Commission in 1966 could not be implemented until after March, 1971.

[S. No. 87 Appendix VII Para 11.106 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 31-3-79]

### **Recommendation**

11.113. The Committee note that during the year 1966-67 to 1973-74, the Commission allocated Rs. 30.05 lakhs to 78 universities for the scheme of publication of learned works and doctoral theses. Whereas 13 universities to which Rs. 5.35 lakhs were allotted did not draw any amount, grants disbursed to the remaining universities were Rs. 11.63 lakhs, representing 38.7 per cent of the allocations. It is also seen that not even one out of 500 copies of a publication

brought out in 1964-65 was sold. It is further noticed that the guidelines had recently been reviewed with the help of a Committee to overcome the deficiencies and weaknesses in the implementation of the scheme and are yet to be considered by the Commission. The committee trust that the University Grants Commission would apply itself to the difficulties coming in the way of utilising the allocations for this scheme and suitably modify the scheme, if necessary, to make it more acceptable.

[S. No. 88 Appendix VII Para 11.113 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

On the recommendation of the Committee constituted by the Commission to advise it on matters relating to the University Grants Commission scheme of publication of research work including doctoral thesis guidelines relating to the scheme have been revised. A copy of these guidelines is attached. (Appendix).

The Commission has also decided to review all the schemes for which assistance was provided during the V Plan and to determine which of the schemes may be continued or implemented with necessary modifications in the next Plan. This scheme would also be reviewed accordingly.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

## **UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION**

### **APPENDIX**

#### **Guidelines for the Implementation of Scheme of Assistance to Universities for the Publication of Learned/Research Work including Doctoral Theses during Fifth Plan period.**

1. The University Grants Commission scheme of assistance to University/Colleges teachers for the publication of learned/research work including doctoral thesis is by way of supplementing the work of private publishers and not by way of replacing the private publisher in bring out high quality publication.

2. A learned research work to be assisted under the scheme should be one that breaks new ground and is useful as reference material for honours and postgraduate studies.

3. Thesis accepted for doctoral degree may be considered for assistance for publication under the scheme only within a period of ten years after its submission.

4. A specific ratio of assistance be fixed for assistance for learned research work and doctoral theses. The allocation made to a university under the scheme be utilised by the universities normally on the basis of 2/3rd for doctoral these and 1/3rd for other learned research works.

5. Repetitive publication should not be considered under the scheme for assistance. Assistance would be available once only for the initial publication. The publication should be printed in India only.

6. The University may either publish the works under its supervision and control or get these published through reputed publishers. Payments towards the cost of a publication should not be made to the author, but directly to the publisher by the university. The author could be consulted regarding the publisher, if it is not done through university press.

7. The authors should not be asked to make any financial contribution towards publication of their approved work

8. The universities may follow the Indian Copy Right Act for deciding the question of Copy Right of the works approved for publication grant.

9. With a view to ensuring a high academic standard the universities should take utmost care in making proper selection of learned research works and theses for publication. The manuscripts should be got assessed by experts, usually by two (other than the examiners) in that particular field. The university may also avail of the services of professional people for editing, referencng, spacing etc., of the manuscripts from the point of view of quality and presentation and may meet expenditure in this regard out of the grant allocated for publication.

10. Besides seeking the advice of commercial interests while selecting a manuscripts for publication, the universities may consider the desirability for appointing sole and/or regional selling agents/distributors.

11. The amount of subsidiary for publication of a thesis should not exceed Rs. 5,000/- unless the university is itself publishing the thesis on its own, in which case it may meet actual expenses on its publication.

12. Where assistance to a publication is substantial, the university should undertake it as its publication and a major part of the money realised through sale (after making provision of royalty to author, Commission to retailers etc.) should be credited to this fund for publications so that it can support more books to be published. The money obtained through sales of books published with UGC support should not be used by the universities as a general sources of revenue.

13. There should be proper coordination among the agencies providing financial assistance for similar purposes, i.e., ICHR, ICSSR, NBT, Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla. To avoid duplication of assistance, the universities should provide a column in the proforma inviting proposals indicating whether a particular scholar has approached any other organisation for financial assistance for the same publication and if so, with what results?

14. The publication of catalogues, critical additions of rare manuscripts and research/reference manuals costing more than Rs. 20,000|— would be considered on merits outside the general scheme of the UGC on all India basis after the work has been examined by the Commission with the help of experts.

### **Recommendation**

The Committee find it distressing that the scheme of "National Award of prizes to Indian Authors" entrusted by the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to the UGC for implementation in 1973-74 has only now been handed back by the Commission to the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare "to be implemented either directly or through some other agency/agencies." From 1973 to-date, the only action taken in pursuance of the scheme was the issue of a Press Notification by the Commission in August, 1973 and "the consideration of a note and 227 entries received in literature under the scheme" by the Panel on Modern Indian Languages. The Panel felt that "this scheme has not perhaps received wide publicity in the regional dailies and even members themselves did not know about the existence of this scheme." The Panel had recommended that this scheme might be readvertised in regional dailies besides the national dailies, and also circulated by means of demi-official letters to the Vice-Chancellors of the Universities and Principals of the affiliated colleges. The delay in the processing and assessment of the entries received in response to the advertisement of the Commission in August, 1973 is attributed mainly to the

shortage of staff with the Commission. The Committee regret the Ministry entrusted this scheme to the UGC in 1973 without ascertaining whether the latter would be in a position to handle it. Later, when the Ministry was requested by the Commission to make available adequate staff to handle the scheme, the Ministry vacillated till as late as February, 1976. The Committee consider this scheme as a valuable one and desire that the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare should take concrete steps to implement the scheme without further delay.

[S. No. 89, Appendix VII, Para 11.119 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

The views of the Committee have been noted and will be given due consideration.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-33/78-  
U.5 dated 23-12-1978].

### **Recommendation**

With the rise in the number of universities from 104 in 1973-74 to 115 in 1976-77 and also in the number of colleges recognised by the Commission from 2974 as on 1-12-73 to 3267 as on 1-12-1976, the volume of work with the Commission must have correspondingly increased. It is inconceivable that a whole-time Chairman and Vice-Chairman would be able to supervise each and every of the varied items of work entrusted to the Commission much less professionally contribute to the academic role of the UGC. In the circumstances, the Committee recommend that Government may consider what positive steps should be taken to make the Commission a dynamic and vigorous body capable of shouldering the increasing responsibilities in the context of the enlargement of the field of higher education. One suggestion that the Committee would like to make is reorganisation of the existing pattern of composition of the Commission which, besides the whole-time Chairman and Vice-Chairman, should have a few more whole-time members.

[S. No. 90, Appendix VII, Para 12.13 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)].



### **Action Taken**

The UGC Review Committee has *inter-alia* made recommendations for the reorganisation and strengthening of the University Grants Commission. The recommendations are under consideration of the Government.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5 dated 23-12-1978].

### **Recommendation**

An autonomous body like UGC dealing with release of huge funds as grants to institutions of higher learning should enjoy the confidence of the academic community as a whole. It is therefore, desirable that an in-built safeguard is provided against misuse of authority by appointing a Vigilance officer or in the alternative by exposing its functioning to periodic review by an independent agency outside the Ministry of Education.

[S. No. 91, Appendix VII, Para 12.14 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

Accepted. A Vigilance Officer will be appointed who would report direct to the Chairman.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5 dated 23-12-1978].

### **Recommendation**

The Committee agree with the suggestion made by the review committee in paragraph 6.15 of their report, February 1977, that the annual report of the Commission should besides giving a true and full account of its activities during the previous year 'also present to Parliament its assessment of problems and perspectives of higher education and of the state of coordination and standards in universities' and that 'the annual reports should be circulated to all universities and State Governments'. The Committee desire that the above change may be brought about as early as possible.

[S. No. 92, Appendix VII, Para 12.19 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

The recommendation made by the PAC would be implemented in the light of the final decision that may be taken by the Government in relation to the suggestion made by the Review Committee in paragraph 6.15 of its report.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5 dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee find that the Annual Report for the year 1972-73 was presented to Lok Sabha on 9-12-74, Report for the years 1973-74 on 18-5-76 for the year 1974-75 on 25-8-76 and for the year 1975-76 on 4-4-77. The Annual Report (1976-77) has not yet been presented. The Committee take a serious view of the considerable delays in the presentation of the reports of the Commission to Parliament and would like the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to ensure that the Report of the Commission is presented to the Lok Sabha not later than 1st October following the year to which it relates, as required under Rule 4 of the UGC (Budget and Accounts) Rules 1962.

[S. No. 93, Appendix VII, Para 12.20 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

As indicated in reply to para 12.18, the machinery for preparation of the annual report has been geared to see that the printed copies of the report are made available by the UGC to the Government by 15th December each year, and not 1st October which was the prescribed date before the amendment of the Rules in 1966.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-  
U-5 dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee were informed that the Annual Report of the Commission is "circulated to every university, college and every state, whenever there is a policy decision". The Committee feel that if the Annual Reports are to include, as suggested by the Committee in an earlier paragraph, the assessment of problems and perspectives of higher education, in which the State Governments are also involved, it would be helpful if copies thereof are, as a matter of course, made available to all State Governments, Universities and recognised colleges or institutions.

[S. No. 94, Appendix VII, Para 12.21 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

Copies of the annual reports of the University Grants Commission are circulated to the universities and colleges and the annual

report for 1976-77 has also been circulated to the Education Secretaries of the States and also the Chancellors of the Universities.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5, dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee have not been able to examine some of the aspects commented upon in the Audit paragraph included in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India for the year 1975-76, Union Government (Civil). The Committee expect, however, that the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare will take due note of the observations of the Audit so as to take remedial action wherever necessary.

[S. No. 95 Appendix VII Para 12.22 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

The observation of the Public Accounts Committee has been noted by the University Grants Commission.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5, dated 31-3-1979]

### CHAPTER III

## CONCLUSIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE REPLIES RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT

### Recommendation

The Committee find that despite the introduction in 1972 of Section 12A of the UGC Act, 1956, making the grants out of Central funds to any university conditional on the declaration by the UGC that such university is fit for receiving such grants and the notification of the University Grants Commission (Fitness of certain universities for grants) Rules 1974, there does not appear to be any substantial improvement in regard to the problem of proliferation of universities and colleges. The number of universities/deemed universities and colleges has increased from 103 and 4158 in 1972-73 to 115 and 4569 respectively in 1976-77. The Committee also find that barring temporary ban on release of further grants the Commission has not so far withheld the grants to any university. The Committee have also noted that the Commission has not used Section 12A of the Act as an effective instrument against proliferation of substandard universities and colleges. The Committee are unable to understand why the UGC could not utilise the power available to them under section 12A of the Act to prevent mushroom growth of universities and colleges without regard to facilities for and standards of teaching.

[S. No. 5 Appendix VII Para 1.52 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)].

### Action Taken

Section 12A of the University Grants Commission Act reads as follows:

“No grant shall be given by the Central Government, the Commission, or any other organisation receiving any funds from the Central Government, to a University which is established after the commencement of the University Grants Commission (Amendment) Act, 1972, unless the

Commission has, after satisfying itself as to such matters as may be prescribed, declared such University to be fit for receiving such grant”.

It will be observed that Section 12A of the University Grants Commission Act does not empower the Commission to prevent the establishment of new Universities or Colleges by the State Governments who are fully competent to enact legislation for the establishment of new Universities. The utmost that the Commission can do is to withhold recognition of a new University for the purpose of receiving grant from Central Government, University Grants Commission or other Central agencies. Out of the ten State Universities established after the introduction of Section 12A of the University Grants Commission Act, only three Universities have so far been declared fit by the Commission under this Section to receive grants from Central sources. It is, however, open to the State Governments to maintain those Universities exclusively out of their own resources.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5, dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee note that during 1975-76, out of a total of 4508 colleges, only 3267, i.e. 72 per cent were recognised by the Commission under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act, 1956. The UGC has undertaken a detailed study to determine the reasons for all the colleges not being included under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act. The Committee observe that this study should be expedited and corrective action taken.

[S. No. 26 Appendix VII Para 6.62 of 73rd Report of P.A.C. (6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

The number of colleges recognised by the Commission under Section 2(f) of the U.G.C. Act, 1956 as on 1st December, 1977 was 3391 against the total number of 4615. The major reasons for all the colleges having not been included under Section 2(f) of the UGC Act are as follows:—

1. 106 Junior Colleges in Assam (25). Bihar (45); Kerala (25); Orissa (9) and Tamil Nadu (2) which are providing instructions upto pre-degree level only and are therefore, not eligible for recognition under Section 2(f).

2. 159 colleges being maintained and run by the universities directly and therefore not eligible to be recognised under Section 2(f).
3. 176 Colleges offering Diploma or Certificate Courses i.e. 88 Music Colleges, 82 Ayurvedic Colleges, 3 Colleges each of Nursing and Pharmacy are included in the total number but are not eligible to be included in the Section 2(f) list.
4. Cases of 261 Oriental Colleges offering various courses or oriental studies are being examined for inclusion in the Section 2(f) list.
5. 15 Colleges being run in the evening have been shown separately in the total whereas these are not included in the Section 2(f) list independently as these are being run by the day colleges only.
6. The remaining about 500 colleges are such which were established recently or during the last 3-4 years and are on temporary affiliation. Such colleges do not normally apply for recognition under Section 2(f) as they would not be eligible for assistance from the Commission/Central sources under Section 12A of the UGC Act till they are declared fit. Such colleges can be declared fit under Section 12(A) of the UGC Act only after they are granted permanent affiliation by the universities concerned.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U. 5, dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee observe that there has been lately quite a sizeable growth in the number of colleges. The number of colleges has increased from 1004 in 1956 to 3297 in 1969-70 and to 4569 in 1976-77. Some of these colleges do not have adequate facilities. This is bound to cause a deterioration in the standards of teaching. Expressing concern over the problem, the Estimates Committee had in their 102nd Report (Third Lok Sabha), suggested that "establishment of such sub-standard colleges should be regulated and controlled in the interest of maintenance of academic standards". Endorsing this view of the Estimates Committee, the UGC had informed the Estimates Committee in June 1967 that it "proposes requesting the State Government to make a survey of the situation in consultation with the universities and suggest ways and means for improvement" and that "on the basis of the survey the Commission will

decide the steps to be taken to regulate the situation". The Education Commission also, in their report (1966) made a specific recommendation that the UGC should, in consultation with the State Governments, examine the question of classification of colleges in terms of level and achievement and make use of it in the allocation of grants to colleges under the Fourth Five Year Plan. The Committee find that despite the recommendations of the Estimates Committee and the Education Commission made more than 10 years back, neither the proposed survey has been completed nor colleges classified in terms of level and achievement. This Committee has been informed that the classification of colleges "is a big task to be taken up by the Commission alone" and that "status reports of each college have to be prepared with the universities concerned with the help of College Development Council". The Committee recommend that the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare should initiate action in this regard forthwith and see that the colleges are classified without undue delay and that this classification is used for guidance in allocation of grants.

[Sl. No. 32 Appendix VII Para 6.78 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The recommendations in the paragraph were considered by the Working Group appointed by the University Grants Commission on the 'Criteria for Evaluation of Colleges' at its meeting held on 27th May, 1978. The Group made the following observations and recommendations regarding the categorisation of colleges;

(a) The working group noted that the Education Commission (1966) had recommended that the University Grants Commission should in consultation with the universities and state Governments examine the question of classification of colleges in terms of level and achievement and make use of it in the allocation of grants to colleges. The Education Commission was, however, aware of the administrative difficulties that would beset any attempt to classify colleges. The working group also noted the recommendations of the Estimates Committee regarding the problem of non-viable colleges and the need for regulating the establishment of sub-standard colleges.

(b) The Working group was in general agreement with the approach of the University Grants Commission in linking its developmental assistance to the colleges with their performance, viability and maintenance of standards. This approach is fully reflected

in the selection of colleges under COSIP, COHSIP, Faculty Improvement Programmes, lead colleges and the sanction of development grants in the range of Rs. 3—10 lakhs depending upon the enrolment and prescribed faculty strength.

(c) In view of the above considerations, the working group did not agree to formal categorization of colleges by a central agency but preferred a system of evaluation including self-assessment with a view to raising standards and the involvement of colleges in community service, particularly adult education and extension work. Colleges may be asked to provide basic data on various aspects along with a self-assessment report. The reports from the colleges may be co-ordinated at the university level, which may be requested to send a comprehensive note on the emerging problems. Similarly the State Governments may be asked to send critical appraisal reports particularly with reference to financial matters, such as the grant-in-aid code, utilization of UGC grants etc.

The Commission at its meeting held on 17th July, 1978 noted the recommendations of the working group on the criteria for the evaluation of colleges and agreed with the view that a formal categorization of colleges by a central agency would neither be feasible nor desirable. It was agreed that the proforma suggested for self-evaluation by colleges may be suitably modified to be made comprehensive and multi-purpose in the light of discussion and comments, if any, from the members of the Commission (Resolution No. 37).

The Commission has since finalised the proforma for the evaluation of colleges (including self-evaluation). This is being issued to Arts, Science and Commerce Colleges in the first instance. A copy each of the proforma and the letters issued to the Principals of colleges, universities and State Governments is enclosed.

[Ministry of Education and Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-  
U. 5, dated 25-11-1978]

(Copy)

SECRETARY

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION  
BAHADUR SHAH ZAFAR MARG  
NEW DELHI-110002

D.O. No. F. 15-9-78 (PF)

September , 1978

Subject: Evaluation of colleges (including self-evaluation).

Dear Principal,

As you know, the University Grants Commission recently adopted a paper entitled 'Development of Higher Education in India—



A Policy Frame' which outlines the main achievements and failures of the system of education in India and suggests a framework for the development of higher education over the next 10—15 years.

2. In order to implement the suggestions made in the policy frame, it was decided to constitute a working group to determine the criteria for the evaluation of colleges.

3. A proforma for the evaluation of colleges (including self-evaluation) has since been finalized on the basis of the recommendations of the working group.

4. I am enclosing herewith four copies of the proforma with the request that a copy each of the completed proforma may please be sent before 30th November, 1978 to the following:

- (i) Secretary, University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002.
- (ii) Registrar of the university concerned.
- (iii) Education Secretary to the State Government concerned.

5. It is requested that you may kindly keep in view the instructions in the proforma to enable the Commission to carry out a comparative evaluation of the colleges on a uniform basis.

6. It may be mentioned in this connection that information supplied by the colleges may also form the basis of grants under various schemes during the sixth plan period.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-

(R. K. Chhabra)

Encl: As above.

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION  
New Delhi-110002

PROFORMA

EVALUATION OF COLLEGES  
(INCLUDING SELF-EVALUATION)

1978

INSTRUCTIONS

1. The self-evaluation report (Section VI of the proforma) may please be prepared in consultation with the members of the teaching staff.

2. Information in this proforma should pertain to Arts, Science and Commerce courses only.
3. Entries should be made only by ball-point or pencil and not by ink.
4. A copy each of the completed proforma may please be sent before 30th November, 1978 to the following:
  - (i) Secretary, University Grants Commission, Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi-110002.
  - (ii) Registrar of the university concerned.
  - (iii) Education Secretary of the State Government concerned.

### SECTION I—GENERAL

1. Name and Address of the College:
2. Please indicate if the College is located in :
 

(a) Rural area	Yes/No
(b) Backward area (as defined officially)	Yes/No
3. University to which affiliated
4. (a) Year of establishment of the college  
(b) Year of affiliation to the university
5. Type of affiliation:  
Temporary/Provisional/Permanent  
(strike out whichever is not applicable)
6. If the college is not permanently affiliated, since when is it on temporary or provisional affiliation?
7. Write a brief note on the fulfilment of conditions of affiliation in respect of—
  - (a) College
  - (b) Particular courses
8. Type of Management
  - (a) State Government
  - (b) University
  - (c) Local Body
  - (d) Private



(b) *Expenditure (In thousands of Rs.)*

*Recurring Expenditure:*

- (i) Research Guiding and Teaching staff
- (ii) Administrative and other staff
- (iii) Equipment (Apparatus, Chemicals, Consumables etc.)
- (iv) Furniture
- (v) Scholarships, stipends and other financial assistance
- (vi) Library
- (vii) Games and sports
- (viii) Hostels

*Non-Recurring Expenditure:*

- (i) Books and Journals
- (ii) Buildings
- (iii) Equipments
- (iv) Other items

## SECTION II—STUDENTS

12. Enrolment course-wise on 31-12-1977

No. of students

<i>Course</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Scheduled Caste/Tribe</i>
1	2	3	4	5

PUC/Inter Arts/XI-XII

PUC/Inter Science/XI-XII

PUC/Inter Com./XI-XII

B.A.

B.Sc

B.Com.

M.A.

M.Sc.

M. Com.

M. Phil.

Ph. D.

(Note : Information should be given only in respect of the courses listed above.)

13. Number of students getting scholarships, etc.

No. of students

<i>Basis</i>	<i>Boys</i>		<i>Girls</i>	
	<i>Scheduled Caste/Tribe</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Scheduled Caste/Tribe</i>	<i>Others</i>
1	2	3	4	5

(a) Merit-cum-need

(b) Merit only

(c) Need only

14. Number of scholarships, freeships and prizes awarded annually by the college out of its own resources for

(a) scholastic achievements

(b) achievements in sports and cultural performances

(c) others

**SECTION III—TEACHERS**

15. Total Teaching Staff as on 31-12-1977

No. of teachers

<i>Category</i>	<i>Professor</i>	<i>Reader</i>	<i>Lecturer</i>	<i>Others</i>	<i>Total</i>
1	2	3	4	5	6

(a) Permanent

(b) Temporary

(c) Ad-hoc

(d) Part-time

(e) Honorary

## 16. Qualifications of Teachers

Qualifications	No. of teachers					
	Professor	Reader	Lecturer	Others	Total	
	1	2	3	4	5	6
(a) D. Litt./ D.Sc.						
(b) Ph.D./ D.Phil.						
(c) M. Phil.						
(d) M. A./ M.Sc./ M. Com. with 1st class marks at the post- graduate examination						

## 17. Number of teachers on study leave etc.

Kind of Study	No. of teachers		
	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78
D. Litt./D.Sc.			
Ph.D./D. Phil.			
M. Phil.			

## 18. Subject-wise number of research publications (in professional and academic journals only) during the years 1975-76, 1976-77 and 1977-78 (Kindly attach a list of publications with full particular of title, author, journal, volume and year).

Subject	Year		
	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78

19. Number and details regarding any major|minor projects of UGC|CSIR|ICSSR etc. which are under implementation by teachers of the college.

#### SECTION IV—FACILITIES

20. Library facilities:

- (a) Total number of books in the library as on 31-12-1977
- (b) Number of books in book-bank, if any
- (c) Number of Reading seats as on 31-12-1977
- (d) Number of journals subscribed to each year during the year 1977-78 (Please give a list)
- (e) Budget provision made by the college for the purchase of books and journals during the year 1977-78
- (f) Academic and professional qualifications of the librarian
- (g) Number and qualifications of Professional staff supporting the librarian
- (h) Actual number of days for which the library was open during 1977-78
- (i) Working hours of the library

21. Number of staff quarters as on 31-12-1977

- (a) Teaching staff
- (b) Non-teaching staff

22. Hostel facilities:

Number of students residing (Position as on 31-12-1977)

- (a) Hostels
- (b) Non-taching staff

23. Laboratory facilities:

Laboratory	Value of equipment as on 31-12-77	Expenditure on purchase of equipment		
		1975-76	1976-77	1977-78
Physics				
Chemistry				
Botany				
Zoology				

24. Extra-curricular and co-curricular activities such as:
- Games|Sports for which facilities are available
  - Strength of NCC|NSS
  - Names and strength of Societies|Forms|Associations functioning in the college

### SECTION V—ADMISSIONS AND EXAMINATIONS

25. Please indicate the number of students admitted during 1977-78, course-wise and division-wise.

Course	Division			Minimum percentage of marks required for admission
	I	II	III	
B.A.				
B.Sc.				
B. Com.				
M.A.				
M.Sc.				
M. Com.				

26. Please give the examination results of the college course-wise for the year 1977 (i.e., both 1977 annual and 1977 supplementary)

Course	Number appeared	No. Passed (Division)		
		I	II	III
B.A.				
B.Sc.				
B. Com.				
M.A.				
M.Sc.				
M. Com.				



## SECTION VI—SELF-EVALUATION

27. Please write in about two pages a note on the main achievements and shortcomings of the college, keeping in view its aims and objectives. The note may particularly highlight the following:

- (a) Academic Programmes.
- (b) Involvement of students and teachers in community service, extension work, social service etc.
- (c) Innovative programmes, viz., autonomous status, remedial courses, restructuring of courses for practical experience, rural development, projects by students and teachers, COSIP|COHSSIP.
- (d) Co-curricular programmes.
- (e) Problems in the utilization of developmental assistance from the UGC.
- (f) Difficulties and obstacles being faced by the college in the realization of its educational goals.
- (g) Level of student discipline.
- (h) Actual number of working days (excluding examinations) during each of the years, 1975-76, 1976-77 and 1977-78.
- (i) Research by teachers.
- (j) Participation of teachers in faculty improvement programme.
- (k) Self-assessment in relation to autonomy.
- (l) If it is a postgraduate college, self-assessment in relation to UGC norms and steps contemplated to remove deficiencies, if any.

(COPY)

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg  
New Delhi—110002

Secretary

October , 1978

D.O. No. F. 15-9|78 (PF)

Dear Vice-Chancellor,

As a follow-up of the paper on 'Development of Higher Education

in India—A Policy Frame' adopted by the University Grants Commission for the development of higher education in India over the next 10—15 years, it was decided to constitute a working group to determine the criteria for the evaluation of colleges.

The working group has since finalised a proforma for the evaluation of colleges (including self-evaluation). The proforma (copy enclosed) is being sent to all arts, science and commerce colleges. The colleges have been requested to send complete information before November 30, 1978 to the following:—

- (1) Secretary, University Grants Commission,  
Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg, New Delhi—110002.
- (2) Registrar of the University concerned.
- (3) Education Secretary to the State Government concerned.

I shall be grateful if through the College Development Council or Co-ordinator, you please ensure that the colleges under the jurisdiction of your university send the requisite information as early as possible and, in any case, before November 30, 1978. We would also like to have a comprehensive report from the University on the emerging problems and difficulties faced by the colleges as also your comments and observations on the performance and profile of colleges particularly in relation to the maintenance of standards of teaching, research and examinations. The report may please be sent some time in December 1978 on the basis of replies received by your office from the colleges.

With regards.

Yours sincerely,

Sd|—

(R. K. Chhabra)

(COPY)

UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION

Bahadur Shah Zafar Marg  
New Delhi—110002

Secretary

October 6, 1978

D.O. No. F. 15-9/78 (PF)

Dear Education Secretary,

As a follow-up of the paper on 'Development of Higher Education in India—A Policy Frame' adopted by the University Grants Com-

mission for the development of higher education in India over the next 10—15 years, it was decided to constitute a working group to determine the criteria for the evaluation of colleges.

The working group has since finalised a proforma for the evaluation of colleges (including self-evaluation). The proforma (copy enclosed) is being sent to all arts, science and commerce colleges. The colleges have been requested to send complete information before November 30, 1978 to the following:—

- (1) Secretary, University Grants Commission,
- (2) Registrar of the University concerned.
- (3) Education Secretary to the State Government concerned.

I shall be grateful if, on receipt of a copy of the proforma filled in by each of the colleges, you kindly coordinate the information, review the position and send us a critical appraisal report, particularly with reference to financial matters such as the grant-in-aid code, utilisation of University Grants Commission grants etc.

With regards.

Education Secretaries of  
All State Governments.

Yours sincerely,  
(R. K. Chabra)

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee have been informed that a number of projects/schemes were taken up altogether outside the recommendations of the Fifth Plan Visiting Committees. According to the Ministry, so long as programmes are within the overall financial ceiling prescribed by the Commission, the modifications sought by the Universities were approved by the Commission. The Committee consider that the recommendations of the Visiting Committees which were made after proper assessment of financial needs of the institutions, would lose their significance if modifications in financial allocation were allowed subsequently. No doubt the university primarily are the best judge of the relative urgency in the implementation of the programme but the relative urgency and approaches can very well be put forward before the Visiting Committees. Priority and quantum of assistance to institutions recommended by the Visiting Committees should normally be adhered to and altered only in rare and exceptional cases on consideration of newly emerging needs. Even in that case, the modifications sought should be considered by another Visiting/Expert Committee before the Commission takes the final decision in the matter.

[Sl. No. 40, Appendix VII, Para 7.32 of 73rd Report of  
PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

It may not be necessary to refer every modification to another Visiting of Expert Committee. The University Grants Commission itself consists of expert members and can consider such modifications. Where necessary, the Commission would consult other experts on the subjects.

(Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-  
U. 5 dated 23-12-78).

### **Recommendation**

The Committee also observe that there is a wide disparity in the per capita maintenance grants on the basis of student enrolment as between the 5 Central Universities *inter se*. The Committee find it interesting to note that whereas in one university *per capita* maintenance grant on the basis of student enrolment for the year 1973-74 was as much as Rs. 5,443. In another university with several disciplines in Humanities and Sciences as well as professional courses like medical and engineering, it was only Rs. 1072. The explanation of the Government for this wide variation in the maintenance expenditure per student, *viz.*, the comparison of per student expenditure among different Central Universities would not be meaningful "in view of the varying nature of facilities provided" does not appear to be very convincing. The Committee would like the University Grants Commission to go into the question of maintenance grants to the various Central Universities with a view to evolve a basis which, as far as possible, dilutes the glaring disparities.

[Sl. No. 51, Appendix VII, Para 9.24 of 73rd Report of  
PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

Grants are not given to the Central Universities|Institutions deemed to be universities on *per capita* basis. The quantum of grants depends upon many factors, such as the stage of development of a university, facilities and courses provided by it, its character unitary, residential, affiliating or federal etc. For the same reason, a comparison of *per capita* expenditure between one university and the other may not be realistic. However, the recommendation made above will be kept in view while determining the maintenance grants of Central Universities.

(Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78  
U. 5 dated 25-11-1978).

### **Recommendation**

The Committee note that the funds likely to be provided in the Union Budget are intimated to the UGC by February/April each year. It is seen that during the Fourth Plan revised budget estimates based on likely allocations intimated by the Government to the Commission were considered by the Commission 7 to 9 months after the receipt of such intimation from Government. Though the position has improved during 1976 and 1977, the Committee would like the Commission to evolve a self-regulatory mechanism whereby the revised budget estimates based on allocation intimated by the Government to the Commission are placed before the Commission for approval not later than one month from the date of receipt of intimation from Government.

[Sl. No. 54, Appendix VII, Para 10.14 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

On receipt of intimation from the Government regarding likely allocation of funds, the estimates are revised in the Commission's Secretariat keeping in view the accepted estimates and the priorities to be given to various programmes/schemes to be implemented during the year. Thereafter a small sub-Committee of the Commission is constituted to recommend the quantum of funds to be provided for various schemes. The recommendations of the Committee are then placed before the Commission (with normally meets once a month) for its consideration and approval. This process, though time-consuming, enables the Commission to make an appropriate assessment of the funds required to complete the on-going projects/schemes expeditiously. Thus a minimum period of 3 months is taken before the estimates as revised by the Commission's Office in the light of provisions accepted by the Government are considered by the Commission. However, efforts will be made to cut this time to the minimum.

(Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78  
U. 5 dated 25-11-1978).

### **Recommendation.**

The Committee observe that the Commission have been keeping with them large funds on which they could have earned some interest. They note that at their meeting held in October, 1977, the Commission have approved the proposal of investment of surplus funds and the matter is awaiting sanction of the Government. The

Committee would like the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to take an early decision in the matter so that large funds at the disposal of the Commission start earning some interest.

[S No. 67, Appendix VII Para 10.69 of 73rd Report of (6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

After examination of the recommendation of the Committee, in consultation with the Ministry of Finance, the University Grants Commission has been informed that it is not consistent with the Government funding procedure to divert amounts of Government grants for investment by U.G.C. in non-Government securities, and that the Commission should review the whole mechanism of utilization of Government grants so as to obviate the necessity of resorting to the practice of short term investments. This is being done. Pending the review, the Commission has been permitted to invest cash balance exceeding Rs. 50 lakhs in short-term deposits.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5 dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee are distressed to note that the scheme of Correspondence course conceived to overcome the extent educational and social problems facing the country, could not be implemented during the Fourth Plan period with the energy and zeal that it deserved. As against the target of introducing the scheme in 20 universities. Only 11 universities could start the scheme and the UGC's expenditure by way of grant to the universities for scheme was a bare Rs. 12 lakhs against the already paltry allocation of Rs. 1 crore. Even during first three years of the Fifth Plan the progress of the scheme in terms of involvement of universities and student coverage as also the expenditure incurred so far by the Commission is none too impressive. The Committee would like the University Grants Commission to persuade the universities which have not so far come forward with the proposals to take steps to introduce the scheme as soon as possible. The Committee trust that the efforts of the UGC in this direction would bear fruit and the number of universities offering these courses, student coverage and expenditure on the scheme would rise conforming to determined targets.

[Sl. No. 68 Appendix VII Para 11.28 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

The Commission is not in favour of every University starting correspondence courses. However, it would be ensured that at least one university in a State does provide facilities for correspondence courses. The guidelines prepared by the Commission for correspondence courses are under review with the help of the Standing Committee on Correspondence Courses.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 23-12-78]

### **Recommendation**

The Committee also find that although in August 1968 the Commission had accepted the recommendation of the Standing Advisory Committee to replace the scheme of Centres of Advanced Study by a Scheme of special assistance to selected departments having "potentialities to build active schools in a particular branch" no action was taken in pursuance of this decision until 1972 when concrete action to recognise 26 departments as Departments of Special Assistance was taken. This inaction to recognise any new Departments as Centre of Advanced Study and delayed action in recognising departments of special assistance resulted in utilisation of only Rs. 4 crores out of an allocation of Rs. 8 crores for the Fourth Plan period. In 1977, the scheme underwent a further modification in that not all the departments recommended by the Panels for recognition as Departments of Special Assistance were recognised as such; some of the departments were recommended for "research support only." Thus under the original scheme of Centres of Advanced Study, apart from the Centres of Advanced Study, two more categories of departments have been included, namely, Departments of Special Assistance and Departments eligible for research support.

[S. No. 74, Appendix VII Para 11.52 of 73rd Report of  
PAC (6th Lok Sabha)].

### **Action Taken**

The Scheme of providing Special Assistance to Selected Departments was not to replace the scheme of Centres of Advanced Study as indicated in the report but it was in addition to the scheme of Centres of Advanced Study and a preparation towards it. As the university departments in different subjects would have attained different stages of growth and levels of achievements, it has been considered appropriate to have different levels of support depending upon the present stage of the development of the department

rather than one single scheme. In view of this Standing Committee has recommended initiation of the three different programmes at different levels. In fact it has been decided by the Commission that no department would be recognised straight away as a Centre of Advanced Study but only after it has functioned under Special Assistance programme for about 5 years and its potential and achievements are evaluated.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78 U.5  
dated 25-11-1978]

### **Recommendation**

11.104. The objective of the Scheme is to encourage Indian Authorship in the production of manuscripts of quality books. The Committee trust that the Commission have a system of evaluating the manuscripts produced under the scheme to see that the assistance extended to the author has in fact served the objective of the scheme.

[Sl. No. 85 Appendix VII Para 11.104 of 73rd Report of PAC  
6th Lok Sabha]

### **Action Taken**

There is no general system of evaluating the manuscripts produced under the scheme to ensure that the assistance extended to the author has in fact served the objectives of the scheme. However, Rule 8.1 for the preparation of university level books by Indian Authors provides as under:

- "8.1. If the author so desires, a committee consisting of three experts in the subject area may be constituted for each title of the book undertaken under this scheme. It would be open to the teacher understanding this project to request the University Grants Commission to constitute such a committee at an appropriate time during the preparation of the manuscript and to consult the members of the committee. This committee would be concerned mainly in ensuring proper standard and quality of the manuscript and may make suitable suggestions to the author in this regard. The treatment of the subject and the manner of presentation would, however, be the responsibility of the teacher to whom the project is entrusted. The same committee would evaluate the final manuscript and make suitable recommendations for its



publication in case a subsidy is asked for, for the purpose."

While constituting the editorial committee the author is requested to suggest five names of the experts in the field; these names are referred to the convener of the panel of the subject concerned for recommending three names for the appointment of the committee. The convener is also at liberty to advise the names of such of the experts as have not been suggested by the author.

There is an arrangement between the University Grants Commission and the National Book Trust under which the latter provides subsidy towards publication of the manuscripts prepared under the UGC Scheme of Preparation of University Level Books by Indian Authors, and specifically recommended by the University Grants Commission for the grant of the subsidy on the basis of the evaluation/recommendations made by the editorial committee appointed for the purpose. While seeking their recommendations, the editorial committee is requested to evaluate the manuscript keeping in view (a) whether the book is of a high standard for use at the university level and (b) whether it could be recommended for suitable subsidy towards its publication.

Under the Rule 3.3 of the revised scheme, the Commission also invites outstanding teachers and scholars to write university level books. Such invited authors may be given a lump sum of Rs. 10,000 for undertaking the writing of the book as approved by the Commission within a period of three years. A grant of Rs. 5,000 generally, is made available in suitable instalments during the period of preparation of the manuscript and the remaining grant of Rs. 5,000 is paid after the manuscript of the complete book as approved has been accepted by the Commission. The acceptance of the manuscript by the Commission is generally done on the basis of the recommendations of the editorial committee consisting of three experts in the subject area which is appointed by the Commission in consultation with the author and the convener of the subject panel. In many cases proposals under this scheme are being approved under Rule 3.3 of the revised scheme, for the last two years.

This would ensure that the manuscripts produced under the scheme would have served the objective of the scheme.

Efforts are also made to ensure that the book writing projects under the scheme are assigned to really competent persons.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78 U. 5  
dated 25-11-78].

## CHAPTER IV

### CONCLUSIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS REPLIES TO WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE AND WHICH REQUIRE REITERATION

#### Recommendation

The Committee also note that out of 3267 colleges recognised by the Commission as on 1-12-1976 only 1649 colleges i.e. one half were not eligible for Development Grants. The Committee would like the UGC to make a study of this aspect and take such measures as may be necessary to make a larger number of colleges eligible for development assistance from the UGC.

[S. No. 27 Appendix VII Para 6.63 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)].

#### Action Taken

The University Grants Commission reviews the conditions of eligibility for development grants to colleges from time to time and will continue to do this exercise.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78 U. 5  
dated 23-12-78].

#### Recommendation

7.83. The Committee note that in 1961, the University Grants Commission noticed that the State had established in 1955 an Institute of Medical Sciences and the Calcutta University already had post-graduate departments in bio-chemistry and physiology and accordingly the University was advised that pending consideration of the scheme by an expert committee, no commitments other than those already made (which were of a minor nature) should be made towards establishment of another Institute of Basic Medical Sciences agreed to earlier in June, 1960 on the recommendations of a Visiting Committee. The Expert Committee recommended in 1962 the integration between clinical and non-clinical subjects for execution of the scheme.

It is disconcerting to note that the modifications suggested by the Expert Committee were not insisted upon before releasing the

grants for the new Institute. Not only that, construction of additional stores for the Post-graduate Institute of Basic Medical Sciences was approved in February, 1972 at a cost of Rs. 11.50 lakhs up to February, 1976, the total payments made amounted to Rs. 9.00 lakhs. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that the Fifth Plan Visiting Committee had visited Calcutta University in September, 1975 and according to information made available to the Committee, the Commission had considered the report on Calcutta University of 29 April, 1976, and not in June, 1976, as contended. In any case, the report was available soon after the visit in September, 1975 and the payment of grant of Rs. 9 lakhs up to February, 1976, was against the principles of financial prudence. The Committee recommend that the circumstances in which release of 9.00 lakhs was made despite the recommendations of the Expert/Visiting Committees and of the Commission itself should be investigated and its outcome reported to the Committee. The proposed probe should also cover the issue as to why releases in excess of the share of 2/3rd assistance were made by the Commission in disregard of the prescribed norms.

[S. No. 41 Appendix VII Para 7.38 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### **Action Taken**

The Calcutta University approached the Commission in September, 1971 to adding two more floors to the building of the Institute of Basic Medical Science at an estimated cost of Rs. 11,54,000. The proposal was considered by the Commission in its meeting held on December, 1, 1971 and the Commission adopted the following resolution:

“The Commission desired that the Calcutta University be advised that the construction of extension to the building of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences may be postponed. Attention of the University may be drawn to the need for teachers hostel and the staff quarters for which the Commission had earlier agreed to provide assistance.”

The Vice-Chancellor later wrote to the Chairman, UGC, in January, 1972 that since the existing accommodation in the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences is insufficient for housing five major departments of the Basic Medical Sciences and the progress of the departments had been suffering on this account, he desired the Commission to re-consider their original proposal for constructing two more floors for housing all the five departments of the Basic Medical Sciences.

The Chairman on 3-2-78 agreed to the proposal in view of the pressing needs of the University. The action of the Chairman was approved by the Commission in its meeting held on 1-11-72 (*vide*, item No. 2(a) (4), as follows:

“The Commission at its meeting held on 1st December, 1971 (item No. 29) considered the proposal of the Calcutta University for construction of extension to the building of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, and desired that the University be advised that the construction of extension to the building of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences may be postponed. Further, the attention of the University be drawn to the need for teachers hostel and the staff quarters for which the Commission had earlier agreed to provide assistance. This was intimated to the University. The Calcutta University intimated that the existing accommodation (three floors) is insufficient for housing the five major departments of the Basic Medical Sciences and the progress of the departments has been suffering on this account. The University again requested the Commission to reconsider the proposal for constructing two more floors for housing all departments of Basic Medical Sciences at an estimated cost of Rs. 11.54 lakhs to be met out of the Fourth Plan allocation. In view of the pressing need of the University, the construction of an extension of the building (2 additional storeys) at an estimated cost of Rs. 11.50 lakhs for accommodating all the departments of Basic Medical Sciences has been approved.”

The payment of Rs. 9 lakh grant referred to by the P.A.C. was sanctioned as follows:—

Letter No.	Date	Amount
		Rs.
1. No. F. 22-33/61(S)D.3a .	14-9-72	50,000
2. Do.	19-2-73	2,00,000
3. Do.	5-11-73	1,50,000
4. Do. . . . .	18-6-74	1,00,000
5. Do. . . . .	6-2-76	4,00,000
		9,00,000

It will be observed from the above that the last instalment was sanctioned before the report of the Visiting Committee was considered by the Commission and even the report as approved by the convenor of the Committee was not available before the sanction of the last instalment.

The additional construction of two floors was sanctioned in 1972 i.e. during the IV Plan period. In that Plan period, the assistance for the construction of buildings was on 100 per cent basis and it seems that it was for this reason that the grant for construction of two additional floors in the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences was agreed to on 100 per cent basis.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78 U.5  
dated 31-3-1979]

### Recommendation

The Committee note that of the 242 projects in progress as on 1 November, 1976, as many as 52 were between 3 and 4 years old and 85 were in progress for more than 4 years. In view of the fact that the original scheme envisaged a tenure of 3 to 5 years for these projects, the Committee would like the Commission to keep a close watch on the progress of each of these projects with a view to ensure that the projects actually fructify and their completion is not unduly delayed.

[S. No. 86 Appendix VII Para 11.105 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### Action Taken

The Commission is keeping a close watch on the progress of all the old projects which have been in progress for a period exceeding four years and requested the concerned authors and the sponsoring institutions to expedite completion, through official and demi-official letters. Sometime back a demi-official letter was issued at the Commission's level. In response some of the authors explained problems faced by them and Commission is trying to help them in overcoming their genuine difficulties. The steps taken by the Commission in this behalf have up to some extent brought about improvement in the position regarding completion of mss. under the 242 old projects; and 45 more manuscripts have been completed, and 5 of the 242 projects have been cancelled due to non-implementation. The latest position (as on 30.11.78) in respect of the projects approved up to 31-10-76 is as under:—

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 1. Projects initially approved           | 362 |
| 2. Projects not taken up hence cancelled | 60  |

3. Projects where manuscripts have been completed	. . . . .	110	
4. Projects in different stages of completion—			
(a) Work yet to be taken up	. . . . .	2	} 192
(b) Projects less than 1 year old	. . . . .	9	
(c) Projects 1-2 years old	. . . . .	20	
(d) Projects 2-3 years old	. . . . .	27	
(e) Projects 3-4 years old	. . . . .	7	
(f) Projects 4-5 years old	. . . . .	35	
(g) Projects over 6 years old	. . . . .	92	

Some of the projects which were pending for 2 years or over on 1-11-1976, are still pending completion as on 30-11-1978 and the number of projects pending over four years of these 242 projects is 127:

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. 7-3/78-U.5  
dated 31.3.79].

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH GOVERNMENT HAVE FURNISHED INTERIM REPLIES

#### Recommendation

The Committee would also like the Central Government/Commission to examine the need and feasibility of issuing regulations under Section 26(1) (e) & (f) of the Act defining qualifications for appointment as university teachers and minimum standard of instructions for the grant of a degree.

The Committee have dealt with the question of modification of regulations under Section 27 of the Act separately.

[S. No. 8 Appendix VII Para 1.59 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

#### Action Taken

The question of framing regulations under Section 27(1) (E) & (f) is being examined. For that purpose the views of the State Governments are being ascertained.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78 U5.  
dated 23.12.78].

#### Recommendation

Notwithstanding the reasons indicated and explanations offered for long delays in the completion of UGC-financed building schemes of colleges/universities leading to cost escalation involving further burden on the Commission, the Committee would like UGC to devise a regular system of keeping a watch over the progress of such scheme until the production of an acceptable completion certificate in respect of the building project.

The Committee also desire it to be examined whether it is feasible to entrust all UGC-financed building projects of colleges/universities to the State PWDs to whom grant money may be paid by the UGC directly.

\* [S. No. 46 Appendix VII Para 8.33 of 73rd Report of PAC  
(6th Lok Sabha)]

### **Action Taken**

Under the Act, assistance is not provided to the State Government but to the Universities/Colleges. The State Governments will, however, be consulted if they could undertake construction of the buildings of the Universities/Colleges as deposit works.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78 U.5  
dated 23.12.78].

### **Recommendation**

8.34. The Committee note that two Delhi based firms of architects have managed to corner over 200 building projects costing Rs. 3.22 crores in universities and colleges spread over 7 or 8 states. The Committee suspect that such cornering of projects costing over three crores by the firms would not have been possible without the connivance of the officers of the Commission concerned with the distribution of building grants. According to a note prepared by the Secretariat of the Commission in pursuance of a query from the Chairman of the Commission on 7 December 1973, the fact that these firms were approaching the universities and colleges with the offer that if the construction work was awarded to them they would be able to secure from the Commission building grants for the universities/colleges, came to the notice of the Commission as early as November, 1969. The Secretariat of the Commission, however, could think of nothing else except issuing a press note and a circular to the universities (and that too 6 months after, in May 1970). No instructions appear to have been issued to the various divisions/sections of the Secretariat dealing with building grants to take special care to see that this situation was not allowed to continue. Even when a recurrence subsequently came to the notice of the Commission in 1972 and thereafter, the Commission was lulled into inactivity by Secretariat officers by the citation of the aforesaid circular of May 1970 as a proof of action taken in the matter and no positive steps were taken to remedy the situation and to prevent its recurrence in future.

8.35. The Committee also note that despite the desire of the then Chairman of the Commission expressed his note of 4 January 1974 that "an enquiry may be made from officers who were incharge of the College Division as to how these two firms managed to corner so many construction projects" and a reminder by him on 4 July 1974 to the Secretary of the Commission to "look into this



personally" and submit to him an early report, the Secretary of the Commission "discussed" this question with only 3 available officers (out of 5 officers concerned) and recorded in the Note put up by him to Chairman more than 7 months after his query that they "informed me that the proposals relating to the construction of the building projects were processed as per guidelines circulated to universities and colleges". He further recorded: "I may in support of these officers submit that we had not taken notice of the name of the firms of the architect which prepared the plans and examined them as they came through the university concerned". He assured the Chairman that "to the best of my knowledge I have no reason to believe any *malafide* intention on the part of these officers." The Committee, however, consider this view of the Secretary of the Commission as belatedly poor attempt to defend the officers concerned with the distribution of building grants in the period before 1974. In order to dispel the strong impression of collusion on the part of the officers of the Commission with the two architects leading to the situation described above, the Committee would like the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to set up an independent enquiry committee to investigate into the matter, and if, as a result of this enquiry, any of the officers of the Commission, irrespective of whether they are in the Commission at the moment or outside are found to be guilty of gross irregularities and collusion with the architects, suitable action should be taken against them.

[S. Nos. 47 & 48 Appendix VII Paras 8.34 & 8.35 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)].

#### **Action Taken**

Government have appointed a one-man Inquiry Committee headed by Shri N. D. Rajan, Chief Engineer (Vigilance), Central P.W.D. to look into the allegations. Its report is awaited.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5 dated 25.11.1978]

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee recommend that the question of compiling Correspondence Course lessons in the form of standard books and publishing them for the use of students may be considered by the Commission.

[S. No. 72 Appendix VII Para 11.32 of 73rd Report of PAC (6th Lok Sabha)].

**Action Taken**

The matter is being referred to the Standing Committee on Correspondence Courses for advice.

[Ministry of Education & Social Welfare O.M. No. F. 7-3/78-U.5 dated 23-12-78].

NEW DELHI;  
*April 24, 1979.*

---

*Vaisakha 4, 1901 (S).*

P. V. NARASIMHA RAO,  
*Chairman,*  
*Public Accounts Committee.*

## APPENDIX

### CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Sl. No.	Para No. of the Report	Ministry/Deptt. Concerned	Conclusion and Recommendations
1	2	3	4
1	1 4	Ministry of Education & Social Welfare (Department of Education)	<p>The Committee hope that final replies in regard to the recommendations to which only interim replies have been furnished will be furnished to them expeditiously after getting them vetted by Audit.</p>
2.	1 5	Do.	<p>The Committee observe that the replies of the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare to several recommendations of the Committee desiring some specific action on the part of the Government merely state that the recommendation has been "noted" or "noted for compliance" etc. without clearly specifying the actual action taken by the Government in pursuance of the recommendation. Although in the classification of the replies given in para 1.3 such replies have been included among the recommendations which have been accepted by the Government, the Committee feel that it is incumbent on the part of the Government to indicate to the Committee the definite and conclusive action taken by Government on the recommendations. Replies of this nature are in respect of recommendations at the Sl. Nos. indicated below.</p>

4, 16, 17, 20, 28, 29, 34, 35, 39, 52, 56, 61; 65; 70; 81; 84; 89 and 90.

The Committee expect a further reply from the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare in regard to action taken in pursuance of the above recommendations.

It has been reported to the Committee by the Audit that the Ministry have failed to make available to them files and material on the basis of which the replies to the various recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee have been prepared and sent to Audit for vetting. The Committee regret that in spite of the established procedure of such files and material being made available to Audit for vetting the replies of the Government to the Committee as a matter of course, and despite the specific request of the Audit to do so, the Ministry of Education and Social Welfare have failed to make available such files and material to Audit. In the absence of vetted replies, the Committee have perforce to formulate their Report on the basis of the advance replies received from the Ministry. The authenticity of which remains unchecked by Audit. The Committee would again emphasise upon the Ministry of Finance the need for ensuring compliance by the individual Ministries of the established procedures in regard to getting the replies to the various questionnaires and recommendations from the Public Accounts Committee, vetted from Audit.

The reply of the Ministry that it 'reviews the conditions of eligibility from time to time and will continue to do this exercise' is too general and casual. The Committee reiterate that a study should be undertaken with a view to enlarge the coverage of colleges for deve-

3. 1.6

Do.

4. 1.10

Do.

lopment assistance and such measures as may be necessary, including relaxations in the conditions of eligibility, may be taken in the light of the findings of the study.

5 1.13 Ministry of Education & Social Welfare (Department of Education)

The Committee had earlier observed that the State had established in 1955 an Institute of Medical Sciences and the Calcutta University already had post-graduate departments in bio-chemistry and physiology. Pending consideration of the scheme by an expert committee, the Calcutta University was advised by U.G.C. that no commitments other than those already made should be made against the establishment of an Institute of Basic Medical Sciences. The expert committee recommended in 1962 the integration between clinical and non-clinical subjects for execution of the scheme. The modifications suggested were not insisted upon before releasing the grants for the new Institute. Not only that, construction of additional floors for the post-graduate Institute of Basic Medical Sciences was approved in February 1972 at a cost of Rs. 11.50 lakhs. The Committee have been informed that the Chairman, U.G.C. agreed on 3-2-1972 to the proposal in view of 'pressing needs of the University'. This was in disregard of the resolution of the Commission adopted on 1-12-1971 on postponement of the construction of extension to the building of the Institute of Basic Medical Sciences. It has been contended that the last instalment of Rs. 4 lakhs was sanctioned on 6-2-1976 before the report of the Fifth Plan Visiting Committees was made available

to the Commission. The Committee have not been informed of the actual date of release of funds as also whether the Convener of the Visiting Committee or any officer of the Commission accompanying the Visiting Committee had furnished an interim report immediately after the visit from September 18 to 20, 1975. The reply of the Government is also silent as to why the U.G.C. was in such a great hurry to release the grant even before the report of the Visiting Committee was available. Nor has any satisfactory reply been given as to why releases for additions to buildings were made by the Commission on cent per cent basis in disregard of the prescribed ceilings of 2/3rd being the share of U.G.C. They accordingly reiterate that a probe should be made into the circumstances in which release of Rs. 9 lakhs was made disregarding the recommendations of the expert/Visiting Committees and the resolution of the Commission itself as also for the release of building grants in excess of the prescribed ceiling, with a view to fix responsibility therefor. The Committee shall await a report on the outcome of the probe suggested by them.

The Committee had desired a close watch to be kept on the progress of each of the projects with a view to ensure that the projects actually fructified and their completion was not unduly delayed. The Committee find from the action taken reply of the Government that although some progress has been made in the completion of manuscripts of projects, out of 242 projects in progress as on 1 November, 1976, the number of projects pending over four years has further gone up from 85 as last reported to the Committee to 127 as on

6. 1.16

Do

30-11-1978. This is indicative of the fact that the efforts of the Commission through issue of official and demi-official letters have not produced any appreciable result. The Committee would like the Ministry to initiate positive steps, including, if necessary, revision of the rules of the scheme, to ensure that the execution of the approved projects for production of quality books is completed within the stipulated period.

7. 1.20 Ministry of Education & Social  
Welfare (Department of Education)

Pursuant to the recommendation contained in paragraph 8.34 and 8.35 (Sl. Nos. 47 & 48) of the 73rd Report of the Public Accounts Committee (Sixth Lok Sabha), the Government had appointed a one-man Inquiry Committee on 25 April, 1978 to look into the allegations about the circumstances leading to cornering of over two hundred building projects, costing Rs. 322 crores, in universities and colleges in several States by two Delhi-based firms of architects and to determine if there had been any connivance on the part of any officials of the University Grants Commission. The Inquiry Committee is stated to have presented its report on 6 December, 1978. The Committee regret that despite the request made on 1 May, 1978, the assurance given by the Ministry on 19 May, 1978 and a communication addressed to the Ministry on 12 April, 1979, the Ministry have not cared to furnish to the Public Accounts Committee for their perusal a copy of the report of the Inquiry Committee. The Committee would like that a copy of the Inquiry Committee report

should be sent to them at the earliest. The Committee consider that a period of four and a half months is too long for the Government to take a decision on the report of the Inquiry Committee. They desire that Government should take decisions on the findings and recommendations in the Report promptly. The Committee would like to be informed of the follow-up action taken on the findings and recommendations of the Inquiry Committee within the next three months, *i.e.* by the end of July, 1979.